THE CONTRIBUTION OF F. D. MAURICE TO ANGLICAN THOUGHT

GEOFFREY C. HINSHELWOOD

Library of the
Church Divinity School
of the Pacific

No. 17520 Class ZT H665
Ex Dono Author
Date 1943

THE CONTRIBUTION

of

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE

to

ANGLICAN THOUGHT

by

The Reverend Geoffrey C. Hinshelwood

A Thesis

Submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirement for the degree of Bachelor in Divinity in the Department of Theology, Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Berkeley, California.

March 1943.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY 1962

Approved:

..... Instructor.

..... Dean.

Filed

.....Date.....

Librarian.

Thesis
Cagle
1943

ZT
H0665

This Thesis
is dedicated to

Phyllis Kathleen

my dear wife
whose
initiative, self-sacrifice
and moral support, made
this work possible.

17520

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/contributionoffr00unse

C O N T E N T S

Page

Introduction

A word about the man 1

A. Religious, Philosophical and Political Movements which have taken place in Protestant circles since 1750.

1. Religious Movements.

(a) Calvinism. 3
(b) Unitarianism. 4
(c) Quakerism. 6
(d) Methodism. 8
(e) Search for a Theology.
1. Germany's Contribution. 9
2. Its effect further afield. 11

2. Philosophical Movements.

(a) Man.
1. As seen in Philosophical circles. 11
2. Butler and Hutcheson. 12
3. The Evangelical point of view. 14
4. The Methodist point of view. 16

(b) Metaphysics.
1. The position of the Evangelical Protestant and the Rationalist. 17
2. Dislike for the metaphysician by both sides. 18
3. Is there a reconciliation ? 18

3. Political Movements.

(a) American Revolution. Basic trouble. 18
(b) French Revolution. 18th century philosophical superficiality. 19
(c) Individual rights and will. A new voice from Switzerland. 19
(d) Power of the State. Burke's influence. 20

B. Frederick Denison Maurice.

1. As a boy, conflicting influences upon his life.

(a) Calvinism, from his Mother. 20
(b) Unitarianism, from his Father. 20
(c) His passion for unity born out of these influences.

Page

2. As a young man. Influences upon his life by:

(a) Coleridge. 21
(b) Tractarians. 30

C. The Viewpoint of F.D.Maurice on certain subjects.

1. The Church of England. 33
2. The Church and State. 36
3. Unity. 38
4. Broad Church and Anglo-Catholic Party. 39
5. Christian Socialism. 45

D. The Theology of F.D.Maurice.

1. General Statement. 51
2. God. 58
3. Christ. 61
4. The Holy Trinity. 63
5. The Sacraments; Creeds; Bible; Prayer Book; Sin; Man; Eternal Punishment; Redemption. 64

E. Influence of F.D.Maurice upon:

1. The Liberal Evangelical Group.

(a) Charles Kingsley. 69
(b) Arthur Penrhyn Stanley. 71
(c) Frederick W. Robertson. 73
(d) Phillips Brooks. 76
(e) William Temple. 82

2. The Liberal Catholic Group.

(a) Henry Scott Holland. 85
(b) Charles Gore. 91
(c) William George Peck. M. 96
(d) V.A.Demant. 101
(e) Herbert Hamilton Kelly. S.S.M. 103

F. Summation. 104

G. Bibliography. 117

The Contribution of Frederick Denison Maurice to Anglican Thought.

Introduction: A Word about the Man.

This paper is not a biography, yet no writing would be complete without a word-picture of the man, who meant so much to his age and whose influence is still felt in theological circles today. In stature Maurice was not a large man. His face, under a wealth of long, black wavy hair of fine silky texture, would arrest the glance of one meeting him for the first time. He had what may be described as a finely chiselled face, beautiful in its serenity and its sensitivity, the product of a quiet nature, the expression of profound thought. Somewhat deep-set dark eyes under heavy eyebrows, an aquiline nose and a wide sensitive mouth, made a picture which, with his longish black hair worn in the fashion of his day, would be hard to pass by or forget. Words of Tennyson would be a most fitting description of him:

"Angels have talked with him and showed him thrones;
Ye knew him not: he was not one of ye;
Ye scorned him with an undiscerning scorn,
Ye could not see the marvel in his eye,
The still, serene abstraction."

In a letter to Mr. A. MacMillan in 1884, Mr. Gladstone wrote:

> "The picture of him (Maurice) as a Christian soul is one of the most touching, searching and complete that I have ever seen in print. He is indeed a spiritual splendour, to borrow the phrase of Dante about St. Dominic. His intellectual constitution had long been, and still is, to me a good deal of an enigma. When I remember what is said and thought of him and by whom, I feel that this must be greatly my own fault." 1

---

1. Correspondence on Church and Religion of Wm. E. Gladstone. Vol.1. p.404.

Not long after Maurice's arrival at Cambridge, Julius Hare wrote of him:

> "A pupil, whose metaphysical powers were among the greatest I have ever come into contact with." 1

Charles Kingsley, one of Maurice's devoted friends said of him:

> "If that character had a fault, it was this, that his humility was carried to an extreme; that, unaware alike of his own intellectual and his own practical and governing power, he would submit at times, when he ought to have ruled and listened, when he ought to have commanded. Save on one point, whenever the interests of duty, honour, chivalry, pity and mercy were, or even seemed in the least at stake, then the humble man became terrible, the docile man uncompromising, and from the gentlest of lips came forth a 'Thou shalt not' of noble indignation, even of noble scorn." 2

At another time, Kingsley wrote these exquisite words concerning Maurice:

> "The most beautiful human soul, whom God has ever, in His great mercy, allowed me, most unworthy, to meet with upon this earth; the man, who, of all men, whom I have seen, approached nearest to my conception of St. John, the Apostle of Love....I looked upon the furrows in that most delicate and yet most noble face and knew what it was meant by bearing the sorrows and carrying the infirmities of men." 3

Such is the picture of Maurice ! From this we can draw upon our imagination as the decades unroll, revealing to us the ever increasing force of this great personality. Before projecting him into the maelstrom of human activity, it will be necessary first of all to look at the background into which he came.

---

1. Maurice F. Life of F.D.Maurice. Vol 1. p.52.
2. Ibid. Vol.2. p.68.
3. Ibid. Vol.2. p.554.

A. Religious, Philosophical and Political Movements, which have taken place in Protestant circles since 1750.

1. Religious Movements.

(a) Calvinism.

Basically, the system of religious thought taught by Calvin maintained that God is the Sovereign Ruler of the world and every good thought comes directly from Him. While this was not new, being as old as the Hebrew writings, he emphasised it in such a way that it impressed itself upon the religious thought of his day and it became the power in the lives of vast masses of people. Calvin followed the belief in predestination to its logical conclusion and he proclaimed that some were born to life and some to damnation. "He hath mercy upon whom He will have mercy; and whom He will He hardeneth." [1] From his doctrine of predestination Calvin assumed the existence in the world of a select body, who are known as the "elect", and a further assumption, that every one in the world can determine in his own mind, whether or no he possesses the "witness in himself", that he is "elect". Conversely, those who have not received the witness within themselves that they are of the "elect", are lost, doomed and damned. Further, it is Almighty God who does the electing, man of himself can do nothing. In effect, this theory destroyed the moral integrity of God and became the hard, cold religion of the Puritans, whose cry, "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon", amply fitted their creed. It was a short step indeed from the Calvinism of that day, to ferret out and destroy by hanging, "witches", whose only sin lay in not being of the "elect", and the intolerance of the Calvinists travelled a strict path of

1. Romans 9:18.

their own chosing in keeping with their beliefs, that made it quite reasonable for them to go to the lengths in their practices as they did in their beliefs.

The English Presbyterians were not untouched by Calvinism They had a tendency to speak in almost Mohommedan sense of One God. In England and later in America, there set in a revulsion of feeling against Calvinistic doctrine and practice. Clergy themselves were unable to accept the idea of such a divided Godhead. Having no authoritative creed to give assent to and uphold, the tendency became a fact, and those who were unable to subscribe to a formula were received into this Presbyterian Group, especially those who were unable to subscribe to a belief in the Trinity. This is not hard to understand, when it is considered that the Calvinistic bodies from the first had deposed the idea of the Incarnation from the place which it had occupied in the older divinity of the Church. The state of humanity was determined by the Fall. It was only the pure, elect body which had concern in the Redemption. This redemption therefore was a means devised by God for delivering a certain portion of His creatures from the law of death to which the race was subjected.

(b) Unitarianism.

It may be thought strange that there should be such an indifference and scepticism in this early 18th century, but when it is fully considered, it will be seen that the excesses of a preceeding era in the Great Awakening, the extremes of the Evangelical Revival, there set in an opposite wave of feeling, which favoured the progress of these tendencies. It will be

remembered that the Unitarianism of the early 18th century, that Maurice called "pure Unitarianism" was a different thing to that of American Unitarianism of two centuries later. The "pure Unitarianism" of the earlier day was a natural outcome of earlier conditions in the rise of naturalistic philosophy, which, coupled with the setting aside by the Calvinists of redemption, except for the elect, brought about a belief that a Supreme Being was not manifested in outward forms but manifested in His works. In effect, this resulted in a denial of redemption through the Incarnation. Thus by such feelings and arguments did the idea of the Unity of God gradually raise itself up in the last age against the faith, which had been recognised in Christendom for seventeen centuries. The force of these arguments lay in the strong inward conviction that the unity of God is a deep, primary truth, which no words can explain away. Coupled with this was a not so strongly emphasised idea, that in the unity of God there must be, in some way or other, a ground of all unity among men, which later became part of the creed of the American Unitarians....."The fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, the leadership of Jesus, salvation by character, onward and upward forever."

The philosophy of Locke and Hume proclaimed that "There is no warrant for acknowledging any Being, eternal, immaculate, invisible; for of no such Being do the senses, or experience arising from the senses, furnish an indication." From such a proclamation, there arose a feeling through society that experience was in general the only root of knowledge, that you were not to believe much which you could not establish by its

evidence. This was opposed by the Unitarians on the basis of its inconsistency. The followers of Locke and Hume were simply affirming something to be revealed or made known to man, which could not be revealed to him ! He was to learn and receive something which he could not learn and receive, a condition, the Unitarians said, which even the Papists had not exacted !

(c) Quakerism.

Mr. Gurney, in his work on the religious peculiarities of the Quakers, says:

> "The doctrine, which lies at the root of all their particular views and practices, is that of the perceptible influence and guidance of the Spirit of Truth. A measure of the influence of the Spirit is bestowed upon all men, whereby they are enlightened and may be saved." 1

According to George Fox, Christ came to establish a spiritual and universal dispensation, therefore, outward institutions like that of Circumcision, like that of a Passover, like that of a Priesthood, of an outward sacrificial worship, of particularly sacred seasons, were abolished. Hence such institutions as Baptism, the Eucharist, the Ministry appointed by the Laying on of Hands and divided into three permanent Orders. Liturgies, the observance of Fasts and Festivals being also outward institutions were to be abolished. This naturally led to the putting aside of the dogmatic Articles, which had become part of the Church through the ages as a result of the Great Ecumenical Councils. Even the simplest of creeds became objectionable to them for the reason that a creed directed the mind upon the outward acts and events of our Lord's life upon earth rather than to His Presence in the

1. Maurice F.D. Kingdom of Christ. p.42.

heart.

Thus a body having these negative characteristics assumed to itself the name of the Society of Friends, who regarded themselves as the witness against the world, which made them keep themselves entirely from the habits of the world, its varying fashions, amusements and even phraseology. Referring back to the peculiarities of the Quakers, as stated by Mr. Gurney, it should be said that they opposed permanent institutions and symbols on the ground, that they are not the remedy or even one of the remedies to maintain purity of life in the world. The condition of a spiritual body, they would hold, is that it rests in the faith, the purity and the vitality of its individual members, consequently it is but a short step to say, as they did say, that all who are not walking in the Divine Light, who do not recognise the Presence and the Guidance of an Invisible Teacher, are of the world. Therefore the pure and holy company, the Church, the Society of Friends, must consist of all, who are led by the Spirit to perceive their connection with the Invisible Guide and to follow Him whithersoever He may lead them.

The question was asked: "What about the children born into the world of Quaker parents ? Are they members of this exclusive society or are they children of the world ?" They must be of the Society, but in order to preserve this, the children must be separated from the surrounding world. What is the answer to all this was asked by these same children as they grew to manhood ? They perceived that between the law by which human society is propagated and the law, which governs the Friends there

is no connecting link. Nothing could prevent the progress of decay in such a body founded upon such ideas. Indeed, it began with the pretentious thought of the Society of Friends, being the kingdom of God, and passed from that high estate to the claim that it is now, that is in Maurice's era, the best of the Sects which compose the religious world.

(d) Methodism.

Generally speaking, the history of Methodism belongs to the history of the English Church. As France has been the centre of the political and Germany of the philosophical movements since the 17th century, so England has been the centre of all religious movements during that period. Unitarianism was essentially impersonal, as an escape from Calvinism, which maintained that a group of individual believers constituted the Church, the Ecclesia, and were to bear witness against the world. This the Unitarians protested, saying that an enlightened age or world was far in advance of those, who pretended to be in separation from it; that the great object, which such an enlightened world should propose to itself, was the extinction of the idea of an ecclesia in whatever shape that idea might present itself.

Luther and Calvin had directed men very much more to the Invisible Object, which men were to contemplate. The Methodists very much more to the operation of a Divine Spirit upon their own minds. The Unitarian emphasis was the denial that it was possible for men to be the subjects of a spiritual influence and this was characteristic of the age which was imbued with it. Methodism, unlike Quakerism, was expressly addressed to large

masses of men; the Power was believed to descend upon them, especially when they were met together. The feeling of an united influence had a great tendency to increase the consciousness of it in each one.

The upper classes of England were indifferent about religious ministrations; the middle classes were not particularly well-affected to the National Church and had provided for themselves in different organised and tolerated sects. The class below these, the "masses" were ignored by the Churchmen as they were by the Dissenters. To this large group the Methodists addressed themselves like the Friars of old and awakened in them thoughts and hopes. This increasing emphasis upon the inner experience led to such an absorbing interest that the idea of the Absolute and Permanent was in danger of being lost. This eventuated in the effort in England to systematise theology on the basis of the religious experience of man.

(e) Search for a Theology.

1. Germany's Contribution.

In Germany, where this emphasis upon experience was felt, students perceived that unless this influence led to a search for theological principles it would melt away. They had seen what the dogmatism of Luther and Calvin had done, that men had become impatient of this dogmatism and sought to escape from it making spiritual motives and consciousnesses all in all. Did not these observations prove that the affections, the seat of these consciousnesses, were the proper and appointed organs of religious belief ?

But Christianity cannot rest upon the affections and feelings; upon the individual experience, but upon a still more awful truth, and that, that truth must in some sense have been given to men in order that they might enter into it. The theology of German thinkers could not rest upon such a purely protestant system. Catholicism it must have, either in the form of pantheism or of definite christianity. The Incarnation presented itself to the evangelical German thinkers as that which must be the groundwork of religion, so that body was created witnessing to justification by faith, but found that it must have a deeper ground than this to rest upon. That ground was found to be the life of the Spirit and the indwelling power of the Spirit, the basis upon which justification by faith was built.

Maurice thought English theology must always be different from German, because it started from a different prihciple and followed a different method. [1]

> "Bunsen's book on the Church of the future", said Maurice, "taught me clearly what I had suspected before, that every earnest German must begin with the Spirit, that he may come to learn something of the Father and the Son. I am as certain as I can be of anything, that our process is the opposite one, that we must begin with the Father in order that we may know something of the Son and of the Spirit.
>
> "We (the English and the German) must be to a considerable extent unintelligible to each other, because we start from exactly opposite points; we, naturally, from that which is above us and speaks to us; they, naturally from that which is in them and which seeks for some object about itself.....I am most anxious to assert the worth of our English position, to prove that truth must look down upon us, if we would look up to it: that Truth must be a Person seeking us, if we are to seek Him." [2]

1. Op.cit. Maurice. Vol 1. p.253.
2. Ibid. vol 2. p.468.

Basically this is the distinction that marks the difference between Hegel and Schleiermacher.

2. Its Effect Further Afield.

With the rise to prominence of Schleiermacher in theological thought and the beginning of the Romantic School, we see the freeing of theology from the dogmatic, rational restraint, resulting in bringing religious reflection nearer to the report of experience. Fifty years had to pass before the rise of the biblical critics. An era of science was on its way, of scientific investigation into everything, including the Holy Scriptures. With the coming of Wellhausen and others, a movement of far-reaching importance was under way, that was to affect every civilised country. From the days of Schleiermacher to the close of the 19th century, German liberal theological faculties were always aloof from the life of the German Church, later resulting in the alienating of Christianity to the masses.

2. Philosophical Movements.

(a) Man.

1. As seen in philosophical circles.

At the time, when Wesley was proclaiming his doctrine of spiritual power, the common faith in philosophical circles was, that man was merely a creature of flesh and blood and unless he lived in the "higher brackets", he had no standing and very few privileges. It was the day of the convict ships that sailed to Botany Bay, crowded 'tween decks with men, who though criminals, were treated in a worse manner than animals. It was the day, when Charles Reade was forced to write, "Never Too Late to Mend," and

"Hard Cash", to bring in story form, such conditions in English prisons, that would arouse the christian Englishman to conditions that were existing in his own country. It was the day, when for diversion on a Sunday afternoon, families would walk around the insane asylums and enjoy the "sport" of seeing inmates, chained and naked, having cold water thrown upon them. Such things as these speak more eloquently than any words as to the value of man in the eyes of the intelligent people of the land.

Of course man had a soul, that was recognised, when thought about, but it was not thought about; and man, who was still under a feudal system, albeit somewhat paternal, was the servant of the increasingly powerful "capitalistic class", with industry becoming more and more powerful. Even as late as the 1920's, following a general coal strike in the Nova Scotia fields, a Royal Commission investigating working and living conditions, stated in their report, that after the working conditions were improved and the living conditions adequate, there remained the so-far untouched fact, that the miners and their families had souls to be cared for.

2. Butler and Hutcheson. [1]

Joseph Butler, whose great work, "The Analogy of Religion" and his "Fifteen Sermons", so often appealed to in the 19th century, were essentially works of their period, being indirect attacks on the prevailing deistical speculations. It is of worthwhile interest to note that while Butler's thesis regarding the moral nature of man, was written during the early 18th century, a hundred years were to elapse before his writings were to be quoted, as thinkers began to regard the inward working of a man

1. Encyclopedia Britannica.

and his mind. That man was not altogether a creature. Butler's systematic account of the moral nature of man, which alone gives value to an enquiry into religion, is set forth in his famous "Fifteen Sermons", especially in the first three, upon "Human Nature". The primary factors of human nature are passions and affections, self-love and benevolence and conscience. Benevolence he develops at some length, showing against Hobbes, that man is intended by nature for society and to benefit society, but by regarding it less as a definite desire for the general good, as such, than as affection for particular individuals, Butler practically eliminates it as a regulative principle. Man's ethical nature for him, is an organic unity, in which conscience, whose function it is to reveal the law of nature, reigns supreme and the inferior elements are subordinated to the superior ones. Virtue then consists in following conscience, but Butler unfortunately gives no satisfactory answer to the enquiry: what course of action is approved by conscience ? He seems to think that everyone knows what virtue is, and that between human nature and virtue, there is a sort of pre-established harmony. This would appear to be exactly what the deists of his day would lack. If a Supreme Creator, having accomplished His task, has then retired beyond the reach of man, how shall human nature realise virtue ? Quite obviously Butler was on safe ground in his approach to Deism by regarding the moral nature of man as the beginning of an enquiry into religion.

Francis Hutcheson, who lived through the same era as Butler, also opposed Hobbes, especially in regard to the functions

assigned to the moral sense. He enumerated five external senses, the most important of these being the moral sense. He claimed that the moral sense was implanted in man and pronounced immediately on the character and action and affections, approving those, which are virtuous and disapproving those, which are vicious. But though Hutcheson usually describes the moral faculty as acting instinctively and immediately, he does not, like Butler confound the moral faculty with the moral standard. The criterion of right action is for him, its tendency to promote the general welfare of mankind. At a later date Niebuhr stated that man has instinctive equipment for the moral life, the instinct for self-preservation, the very struggle for survival reaches out with altruistic import. [1]

This is exactly what this late nineteenth century needed more than anything else. The German theologians in their search for a practical theology, became so academic, that they never did reach the christian church people. The dogmatism of the German evangelicals ran aground on the subjectivity premise and its emphasis upon the individual's inward condition of his own soul. The moralists Butler and Hutcheson, the latter in particular were heading clearly in a direction that was ultimately going to break up the "caked" theology of that day and head it towards which Maurice was to carry it, namely in the direction of altruism. Into these numerous theological and philosophical theses came Maurice, the forerunner of the objective aspect of the christian life.

3. The Evangelical Point of View.

The Evangelicals of the continent and England maintained

1. Aubrey. Present Theological Tendencies. pp.55-110.

a very much narrower view on the nature of man, than did the Catholics. Catholic doctrine has always been more liberal on sin and grace than the Augustinianism of the early protestants. The moral influence of the atonement is only part of the full catholic doctrine. There is a place, where the Catholic and Protestant divides and the former finds his place at the altar, not only as an individual but also as part of the Body of Christ, the Church, corporately. The Evangelical, however, taught that man's soul was his all in all; the salvation of the soul was paramount; men were guilty of neglecting their souls, yet if asked if they regarded man as a spiritual being would have said no. To the Evangelical, an unconverted man is a carnal thing, there is nothing spiritual about him. So, in a sense, while decrying philosophy, yet a certain amount of material philosophy was incorporated into their doctrine of man. [1]

Theirs was a system of thought by which an established way of living is justified and guided. Any philosophy of religion has three functions, to sustain, to explore and to transform. The Evangelicals, or as they might be called, traditional supernaturalists, principle part was to sustain. Their position was a powerful one, coming from ancient tradition with a clarity and a systematic completeness not found elsewhere and their entire outlook presented a realm of thought and feeling, which stood in glowing contrast to the rest of life. There was however, a rigidity about their outlook, a lack of flexibility and wide comprehension. [2] As the old Puritans had cried, "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon" in their day, so might the Evangelicals of a later day have cried,

1. Op.cit. Kingdom. vol 2. pp.169ff.
2. Wieman and Meyland. American Philosophy of Religion. chap 4.

"Earnestly contend for the faith, which was once delivered unto the saints." [1]

4. The Methodist Point of View.

In their doctrinal attitude on man, the Methodists handed an important instrument into the hands of the philosophers, changing the philosophic view and bringing about a philosophic revolution. This revolution may be stated that, all the powers and properties that man has within him, which cannot be known by the senses, are what constitute man. Thus a dynamical philosophy gradually superseded a mechanical one. A considerable number of persons in Germany, France and England believed they had found an explanation for most of the facts, which readers of the Bible attribute to the power and the Spirit of God. Treat people as material and mechanical creatures and one is puzzled to explain the feelings and experiences of pious people. Treat them as spiritual beings and everything can be accounted for, such as divine interventions, spiritual illuminations and miracles. So it would appear as if the injection of philosophical thinking into the realm of theological dogma, was loosening up the entire "congested" fabric, so that at last the nature of man was to be seen by the "man in the street", as a human being with spiritual propensities and a capacity for appreciation of the finer things of life, rather than a mechanical creature. Indeed, may we not say that much of the good and much of the evil, which distinguished the preceding age, can be attributed to the exclusive study of natural philosophy ? [2]

1. St. Jude. chap.3.
2. Op.cit. Kingdom. vol 2. p.150 ff.

(c) Metaphysics.

1. The position of the Evangelical Protestant and the Rationalist.

Reflecting upon the philosophic revolution that had taken place, one can see that Martin Luther had asserted the doctrine, that there were certain truths, which were so necessary to the life and being of man that the simple proclamation of them, "the foolishness of preaching", would carry home the conviction of them to innumerable hearts. This was the first act of the Reformation. In the second act we see Luther's disciples poring over the words of this book, in the hope of extracting some meaning from them; then fighting with one another in defence of the fragment of meaning, which they had discovered in it. A third act opens with another generation tearing out page after page from this book, because it speaks of unintelligible matters with which reasonable men have no concern.

The protestants say that every truth is to be realised by each man for himself and that, when a certain number of individuals have been made conscious of the same truth, they are to meet together and have fellowship in the profession of it. They have never effectually taught men, that there are truths appertaining to them as men, which do not depend for their reality upon their consciousness of them, but are the grounds on which that consciousness must rest. The doctrines of protestantism refer distinctly and formally to men as individuals. The systems of protestantism not only do not affirm it, but in the most practical manner deny it. The metaphysical revolution pointed to one thing, the demand

for something Catholic.

2. Dislike for the Metaphysician by both sides.

There is common to both sides a dislike for the metaphysician: one because he seems to bind down the energy and freedom of man by fixed and absolute laws: the other, because he sets up a dry truth against all forms and images.

3. Is there a Reconciliation ?

Maurice states that if the above tendencies be true and sound, then there ought to be some method of bringing them into harmony and a reconciliation effected between warring opinions and feelings and thus preserve each of them in its strength. [1]
It would appear that Maurice himself had no answer to this problem.

3. Political Movments.

(a) American Revolution. Basic Trouble.

From the time of the Reformation, there developed an anxiety to assert the rights of national sovereigns. When the protestant systems developed, the monarchs of the reformed states found themselves in danger of losing their authority due to the individual's rights to act and think for himself. The feudalism, albeit mild, of that day was coming to an end. The Calvinists resolved, that if the state could not be religious with a Sovereign it would be religious without one. The government of the puritan colonies bore every mark of this origin. They might be called.... "sect-commonwealths". The fatal mistake that England made has since been shown in the complete lack of understanding of a "new order" of things in the colonies. In refusing to observe or admit

---

1. Op.cit. Kingdom. Vol 2. p.202.

that the men, who broke away from English Church Law, did so not because there was any innate desire to adopt a traitorous attitude toward the realm, but for the freedom of their own spirits. We can say with reasonable certainty, that much of this present war is being fought against the Axis for the same principles that urged the early American colonies to resist the will of the English autocracy.

(b) French Revolution. 18th Century Philosophical Superficialities.

The Parisian philosophy of the 18th century was little more than the expression by men, cleverer and bolder than their contempories, of that feeling, which pervaded the whole of society. It was very superficial. The literature of that day, the attitude of the Royal Court was one of irreverance, scepticism and lasciviousness; the common people were looked upon as canaille. When the mobs finally got control and Madame Guillotine was in command, one cannot but help sympathising with the revolutionary song:

"Ça ira, ça ira, ça ira,
Les aristocrats, les aristocrats;
Ça ira, ça ira, ça ira,
Les aristocrats, ons les pendra !"

(c) Individual Rights and Will. A New Voice from Switzerland.

Then came a voice from Switzerland, proclaiming that each man had in himself, apart from all social institutions and social civilisation, rights and power; that he may claim those rights and put his power forth, if he would break the bonds, which the elite had been fastening upon him. Here we have the seed of that which blossomed into the French and American Revolutions.

(d) Power of the State. Burke's Influence.

Burke in England taught that law rests upon deep invisible principles, not upon philosophical maxims or generalisations. That it is to be feared and reverenced. How much Burke was the instrument of restoring the tone of English feeling: following the terrific revolutionary upheavals in France and America; both among men of action and meditation, both in the upper and middle classes, many are ready to confess.

B. Frederick Denison Maurice.[1]

1. As a boy, conflicting influences upon his life.

(a) Calvinism from his mother.

F.D.Maurice was born into a divided family, a family seemingly mutually agreed to remain within each one's own theological tendency. His mother was a strong Calvinist and made no light matter of announcing that Calvinism was true. His early teaching from her emphasised that one must possess a certain testamur called faith. Calvinism taught that it shall be believed in from within, not from without. His mother coveted that her son should be one of the elect. So deep was her own piety, that she was convinced that she herself was not one of the elect. This idea was present through Maurice's boyhood. It pressed upon him afterwards and the fact itself is an important feature during his lifetime.

(b) Unitarianism from his father.

His father was an Unitarian minister and remained so, until his death, but there seems to be no evidence that young Maurice received any direct teaching from his father, that might

---

1. Op.cit. Life. vols 1.2.

conflict with that of his mother. However, later in his boyhood he was taken into his father's confidence in all his practical schemes of social improvement, which may have had a greater effect than teaching by word of mouth.

(c) His Passion for Unity born out of these Influences.

It is not hard to understand, that as a boy, he was puzzled into silence by conflicting stories and influences. He developed the more profound kind of silence. Both his parents were good people and out of the differences of their faith grew his passion for unity, which he said, "haunted me all my life through."[1]

2. As a Young Man. Influences upon his Life by:

(a) Coleridge.

Maurice stated: "I had no inclination to infidelity. Coleridge had done much to preserve me from that."[2] In order fully to appraise the very great influence that Coleridge exerted upon the life of Maurice, not only in his earlier, but in his more mature years, it will be necessary to look rather extensively at Coleridge's entire philosophy of life, particularly his attitude toward Church and State. The concept of balance, or rather of order, achieved through the balance of the different elements composing national life, was the heart of Coleridge's philosophy.

It was necessary that a christian social order be created out of the disorder left by the industrial revolution and the emancipation of the individual from the social and cultural restrictions of the middle ages, which that revolution completed. First there was the problem created for the Church by the Age of

1. Ibid. vol 1. p.41.
2. Ibid. vol 1. p.177.

Reason, and the increased secularisation of life it fostered. Eighteenth century rationalism had seemingly made a defence of rationalism impossible. Certainly, men in general, thought that they could get along without religion and believed that science and reason was sufficient to meet their needs. The Established Church of England in particular was considered useless. Then associating with this trend away from religion was the problem of the relations of Church and State. Long before the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, which had prevented Dissenters from holding office in the state, and catholic emancipation, which gave to Romanists the status of English citizens, the English government had lost whatever religious significance it had once possessed, when following the Reform Bill, Parliament, in which Romanists, Dissenters and utilitarian reformers had the balance of power, set out to reform the Church. Anglican churchmen were forced in desperation to examine the relation of the Established Church to the State.

The industrial revolution presented a third problem to the Church. In destroying the handicraft system of production and shifting the emphasis from agriculture to industry, the revolution had produced a divided society, described by Disraeli as "two nations between whom there is no intercourse and no sympathy.....,as if they were dwellers in different zones." [1] The Church as an institution which had, during the greater part of its existence, set itself to exercise and influence the social ordering of men's lives, could not ignore such breaches within social life. Sooner or later it would come to grips with the

1. Gloyn C.K. The Church in the Social Order. p.6.

economic philosophy supporting such a society. Finally, amid the general romantic reaction against the age of Reason, which began toward the end of the 18th century, the spirit of nationalism had reappeared. English conservatives sought to use this revived nationalist spirit to defend their own position. In contrast to the individualism of the liberals, conservatives put forward the idea of the nation. They countered the reformers' appeal to reason and natural rights by an appeal to tradition, the past history of the British as a people. This too, presented a problem to some churchmen, particularly those of the Oxford Movement, who saw the dark side of nationalism. These men looked to a past, when there had existed a world society, an undivided christendom. Was not nationalism, they asked a repudiation of that past; were not national churches a denial of catholicism ?

Coleridge was among the first to see the impending social convulsion. In a speech at Bristol in 1795, he had said:

> "Society as at present constituted, does not resemble a chain that ascends in a continuity of links.....alas ! Between the parlor and the kitchen, the tap and the coffee room, there is a gulf that may not be passed." 1

Coleridge was not content with the answer, that in the evils of a system and the periodical crash, it is just so much superfluous steam escaping from the safety valves in a self-regulating machine, that in a free and trading country, all things find their level. Things may find their level,

> "But persons are not things", said Coleridge, "but man does not find his level. Neither in body nor soul does.....man find his level. After a hard and calamitous season, during

1. Coleridge H.N. Essays on his own Times. vol 1. p.21.

> "which the thousand wheels of some vast manufactory had remained silent as a frozen water-fall, be it that plenty has returned and that trade has once more become brisk and stirring; go, ask the overseer, and question the parish doctor, whether the workman's health and temperance with the staid and respectful manners best taught by the inward dignity of conscious self-support, have found their level again." 1

Coleridge objected particularly to the 18th century view of reason. Locke and to an even greater degree, Hume, had shown that reason could not produce intellectual certainty, though adequate for the practical needs of men. There are two aspects of Coleridge's concept of reason as shown by Gloyn. [2] First, practical as the fountain of ideas and the light of conscience and moral truth. Secondly, speculative, in relation to formal principles of abstract truth.

> "All we can or need to say is, that the existence of a necessary Being is so transcendentally rational, that it is Reason itself, and that there is no other form under which this Being is contemplatable, but that of a holy and Intelligent Will. Admit this and all is solved, deny it, and all is darkness." 3

Coleridge held that a religion, wherein man was to hunger and thirst after righteousness and the rewards of the righteous, is so far above the average man, that it leaves the understanding vacant, thus men's minds become increasingly filled with present and temporal things and a shrewd knowledge of business. So that the commercial spirit might be counteracted, he maintained that religious faith ought not

> "to be buried in the dead letter of evangelical bibliolatry, nor should

1. Coleridge H.N. Statesman's Manual. pp. 403.404.
2. Gloyn Op.cit. p.29.
3. Op.cit. Statesman's. p.229.

"its name and honours be usurped by
a counterfeit product of the mechanical
understanding." 1

To develop such a state of mind, to promote a religion that was "head and heart satisfying" was the task set for the clerisy and which the established church clergy had failed to perform. To understand what Coleridge gave to Maurice is to understand much that was characteristic of Maurice's thought, and to understand what Maurice did with his heritage from Coleridge is to understand more clearly what has not been always understood, the truly seminal quality of Coleridge's teaching. [2] The chief thing that Maurice got from Coleridge was not a set of ideas completely worked out, but a mode of thinking, a way of using the mind. Both Coleridge and Maurice are more easily and rightly understood in the light of each other. Maurice revealed the power of Coleridge's influence on him in many ways; by showing an extensive and continuing familiarity with Coleridge's ideas and mode of thought, by maintaining an interest in various projects generally associated with his name; by coming to his defense whenever occasion demanded; by often expressing openly his gratitude and by employing Coleridge's method and ideas in various practical enterprises of his own.

In 1870, two years before his death, Maurice wrote to his son a letter, in which he explained how his early religious opinions developed, and discussed the value, which Coleridge's teachings had had for him in youth. It was at this time that he credited Coleridge with having helped to save him from infidelity when he was young. [3] Maurice died on April 1st. 1872. Throughout

1. Ibid. p.230.
2. Sanders C.R. Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement. p.185ff.
3. Op.cit. Life. vol 1. pp.176.177.

the writings of his maturity and old age, there is evidence of a discrimination in his approach to Coleridge, but of a discrimination that was always associated with and dominated by a life-long reverence and affection, a persistent holding-on to what seemed vital in Coleridge's tendencies of thought, a desire to communicate to others what seemed valuable in his teaching, a constant willingness to defend the teacher and his doctrines against the attack of those, who from one motive or another, appeared to misrepresent them or would not take the trouble to understand them.

Most of the differences between Coleridge and Maurice were of degree only. Coleridge's method was more analytical and more psychological; Maurice's more theological and more simple in language. Coleridge was able to present only fragments of thought, which, however, were all related to an organic whole; Maurice, with all his hatred of system of thought, rarely discussed any subject, which he did not treat methodically and exhaustively. Maurice was Coleridge's equal in intellectual subtlety, though not in depth. Coleridge's phrases are often more poetic; Maurice's are better aimed to satisfy the spiritual needs of the masses. But Maurice's chief departures from Coleridge were those in which he extended his teaching method.

In his search for an underlying theological unity, reconciling the opposing religious sects and the different classes in society, Maurice was influenced considerably by the metaphysics of Coleridge.[1] In addition to Coleridge, we would mention in passing, two other men, who in a large measure assisted in the development of Maurice's theology; Julius Hare and Thomas Erskine,

1. Op.cit. Gloyn. p.85ff.

the former through his lectures on Plato, when Maurice was in Trinity College.

> "Of Sophocles and Plato, I can trace the most permanent effect on my character." 1

Erskine, through his appeal to internal evidence as the test of the truth of christianity and his Calvinistic concept of God, as a God of individuals and nations and having infinite power, Writing to a young theological student, Maurice said:

> "The two great treatises of Plato and Aristotle will be master keys to the minds of these men: you will see them both in their greatest strength and at the same time in the most remarkable contrast. Both, Aristotle especially, will cast light upon and receive light from all contemporary and preceding Greek history. The Republic of Plato is, in its highest aspect, the dream of an universal church, in its lowest it touches closely upon French communism. It is very wonderful in both respects, and will not at all disengage you from your present interests, but rather will help you to contemplate them from a higher point of view. Aristotle's with no ecclesiastical or generally human characteristic, is as beautiful an account of the conditions and forms of national life and its relations to family life, as I can conceive. Its true complement is in the Old, as that of Plato is in the New Testament." 2

Again:

> "I have always contended that Plato is quite as practical as Aristotle; nay, if he was rightly studied as he would have us study him, in connection with the life and purpose of Socrates, he is more practical..... on the whole I should hold fast to Plato and Aristotle and make the other books of the course illustrative of them." 3

---

1. Op.cit. Maurice. Life. Vol 1.p.55.
2. Ibid. vol 1. p.465.
3. Ibid. vol 2. p.38.

Maurice valued Coleridge's philosophy mainly because, according to Maurice's interpretation, Coleridge neither disparaged, as did the Tractarians, the speculative understanding, nor ignored, as did the Empiricists, the insight which enabled men to know spiritual truths. The major difference between Coleridge and Maurice was, that Maurice, interested primarily in theology and in one aspect of the Calvinistic doctrine of God as Infinite Power, accentuated more than Coleridge, the comprehensive attribute of what Coleridge called the Absolute Reason. God as the Absolute Reason, revealed to man's reason, so dominated Maurice's thinking that he sometimes lost sight of the human element involved in all thought and action.

Coleridge's idea of the State, in a larger sense, includes the idea of the national church. In this sense the state has two poles, the political pole or idea of the state and the cultural pole, or idea of the national church. Together they form the constitution of the nation. The national church is an estate of the realm incorporating the learning and knowledge, intellectual and spiritual of the country, standing opposed and serving as a counterbalance of the state conceived in its narrower sense. While the King is the

> "head of the national church", said Coleridge, "or clerisy and the protector and supreme trustee of nationality, bound by his coronation oath to protect the safety and independence of the national church, Christ alone is Head of the Christian Church and only through His Presence in all local churches are these united with each other. While the national church is institutional and local, the

> "christian church is universal, neither Anglican, Gallican, nor Roman, neither Latin nor Greek." 1.

Though Coleridge clearly distinguishes ideologically the national and the christian church and the respective functions of each, he does not clear up the actual relation between the two as found in England.

> "In relation to the national church, the Christ is a blessed accident." 2

National churches have existed before the institution of the christian church, but in England, there exists both a christian and a national church. There is no mention by Coleridge of episcopacy in the characteristics by which he identifies the christian church. His idea of the christian church is not anglo-catholic., in the present sense of the term; it might be better called, "congregational catholicism". In 1832 Coleridge wrote:

> "The Church is the last relic of our nationality, would to God that the Bishops and Clergy in general, could once fully understand that the christian church and the national church, are as little to be confounded as divided." 3

The significance of this conservatism of Coleridge's theory of the church is obvious: The national church is entrusted with the function of upholding the ideal of the nation, of making the conflicting groups within it, an organic whole, a moral unit. In developing his social ideal he overlooked the growing class struggle within the divided nation. This Maurice, Kingsley and the Tractarians saw very clearly.

---

1. op.cit. Statesman's pp. 39.40.
2. Ibid. p.59.
3. Shedd W.G.T. The Table Talk of the late Samuel Taylor Coleridge. p.237.

(b) Tractarians.

The Tractarians shared with Coleridge [1] his fears for the society of the day. The social conditions of the time forced Coleridge to develop a social philosophy of conservative collectivism in which the guiding principle was the idea of the nation. The views of the men of the Oxford Movement were similar, though held primarily from a religious, rather than a social motive , Froude, Keble, Mozeley and Newman agreed with Isaac Williams, holding that faith yielded insight independent of examination. In Tract 87, Williams said:

> "With regard to any knowledge that is truly valuable, the unhallowed intellect can of itself learn nothing. As in all other matters.....God will reveal Himself only to the pure in heart, to the humble and such as keep His Commandments." 2

Newman considered reason unnecessary:

> "The act of faith is sole and elementary and complete in itself and depends upon no process of mind previous to it." 3

Faith then, puts reason aside as out of place and proposes instead a simple obedience. But this implies authority to which obedience is given. For the Tractarians this authority was the Church; a visible institution founded by Christ, governed by a divinely enjoined episcopal order and possessed of the Sacraments, which, administered by the successors of the Apostles are the channels of "covenanted" grace. Authority in the static concept is the ecclesiastical authority given by the bishop through the apostolic succession. It is the authority given catholic doctrine by tradition. The second

1.Op.cit. Gloyn. p.47ff.
2. Tract 87. p 104.
3. Newman J.H. Fifteen Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford. p.202.

concept of authority they emphasised looks not to the past, but to life itself, to wit, the power of the authoritative church to produce the life of holiness. The Church of Christ is a fact, a visible society. The Church is the only way to salvation, which salvation is based upon the objective efficacy of the sacraments. This depends upon their administration by apostolically appointed priests, that is, on the apostolic succession of the bishops, who as successors of the apostles are the inheritors of the gifts of the Holy Ghost.

Submission to the Church is the test of christian allegiance:

> "Submission to church authority is the test, whether or not we prefer unity, and the edification of Christ's Body, to private fancies." 1

Defence of the Church is required of all it followers:

> "Laymen are quite as much a part of the church as the clergy; and it is your right and duty to stand up in its defence, as much as it is ours." 2

What is significant for the study of the social theory of the Tractarians is not the dualism evidenced in their concept of church authority, but the fact that their emphasis arose out of the belief that church authority was the paramount need of the time. Newman testified that he believed church authority alone could bring order out of the chaos of unrest and the confusion of opinion resulting from the uncontrolled use of the speculative intellect. [3] Like Coleridge, the Tractarians considered the fact of establishment merely accidental. Coleridge had maintained

1. Tract 61. p 3.
2. Tract 43. p 15.
3. Newman J.H. Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine. p. 89.

that it was a fortunate accident. [1] The Tractarians were not so sure. As early as 1833, Newman had written in a letter to Bowden:

> "I fear that the church is being corrupted by the union." 2

> "We had rather be a church in earnest", wrote Keble, "separate from the state, than a counterfeit church in professed union with the state." 3

The Tractarians repudiated the secularism of their time on two counts; the first was the criticism they made of the commercial spirit and then the conviction that the ills of society were not to be solved by social legislation. Their criticism of the commercial spirit was like that of Coleridge, who had said that commercial interests had assumed an undue prominence in the national life. The Tractarians differed from Coleridge in that, whereas Coleridge criticised the undue commercial spirit, because it created social disorder, they opposed it primarily because it was "prejudicial to.....spiritual interests." [4]

Maurice was not altogether in accord with the Tractarians in many things. In his writings he seems to suggest that the Tractarian conceived God as merely "the Provider of a scheme for man's deliverance, or the Setter-up of a Church-system." Pusey declared that he and Maurice worshipped different gods and Maurice accepted the statement. There was a further dispute between the two great men concerning the "hopeless torments of future punishment." [5] Maurice held that the present human society is "already in God's Order and only needs to realise it."

1. P 37. This paper.
2. Newman J.H. Letters and Correspondence. vol 1. p 419.
3. Keble J. Occasional Papers and Review. p 226.
4. Newman J.H. The Via Media of the Anglican Church. vol 1. p 158.
5. Op.cit. Life. vol 2. pp.43.44.

His views imply that the process may be evolutionary. The Tractarians' view necessarily supposed that it must be revolutionary in the moral and philosophical meaning of the term.[1] Maurice disagreed with Newman on numerous counts and seems to doubt whether Newman is a Platonist; he says it is the great evil of everything at Oxford that there is nothing but Aristotelianism. And I find that it was the superiority of Cambridge in this respect that made him think it so much better for him to go to the latter University. Maurice stated that all children are Platonists and it is their education which makes men Aristotelians.

To Archdeacon Hare, Maurice wrote:

> "The Christian Review says that I am a Tractarian in my heart, a much more tolerable accusation than that of being a via media man, which they also heap against me." 2

This was written, because of his stand and prophecy that those, who were now triumphing over the condemnation of Pusey by the Vice-Chancellor would in six or seven years, wish that such a condemnation had never been pronounced.

C. The Viewpoint of F.D.Maurice on Certain Subjects.

1. The Church of England.

It will be remembered that Maurice was born of parents, one of whom was an Unitarian minister and the other a rigid Calvinist. As a young boy in his 'teens he did much hard thinking. Shortly after his twentieth year, he was outspoken in despising hide-bound Toryism and declared himself in favour of the Reform

1. Peck Wm. G. The Social Implications of the Oxford Movement. p 52.
2. Ibid. p 353.

Bill of 1832.[1] In the Athenaeum, which he edited, he wrote denouncing all moral or inspired writers, who showed mental darkness, that is to say that condition of mind in which it is quickened by no thoughts, impulses or feelings.[2] Having carefully thought through his position, he was baptised into the Church March 29th. 1831, at the age of twenty six. In 1832, he was received as a Curate and sent to study under the Reverend Mr. Stephenson of Lympsham. He was told by his Rector and tutor:

> "You must aspire high, if you would know yourself to be nothing. If you feel yourself to be the worm that you are, you must claim your privilege of being like God." 3

Maurice's basic belief concerning the Church of England, was that the English Church was more faithful than most of the sects, which despise her, but not as fulfilling his idea of the catholic church. To this end he thought and wrote.[4] In a letter to the Reverend R.C.Trench in 1841, he wrote:

> "My own greatest anxiety at this time is to bring out the highest form of Catholicism (not of Anglicanism) as the direct opposite of popery and to show that popery is not the excess of everything good, but simply the denial of it." 5

He disliked the term Protestant Church.

> "A church united merely in a profession of a certain doctrine, though it be the true evangelical doctrine, is one which I cannot, without difficulty, form to myself the notion; for the evangelical doctrine seems to speak of a kingdom, which is one and universal. The doctrine of a visible centre I affirm to be a monstrous political heresy, the evil effect of which, upon the order and unity of the church, all ecclesiastical history is manifesting." 6

1. Op.cit. Life. vol 1. p 79.
2. Ibid. vol 1. p 82.
3. Ibid. " p 143.
4. Ibid. " p 306.
5. Ibid. " p 321.
6. Ibid. " p 325.

He found Protestantism to contain a great positive witness needful for the support of catholicism. Holding, as Maurice did, the belief that the catholicism of the Anglican Communion was more important than Anglicanism as such, he also upheld Anglicanism itself as being more desirable from a positive position than the negations of what he termed the protestant sects. In a letter to Dr. Samuel Brown, in reply to a criticism of "The Kingdom of Christ," Maurice shows the parts of the book, between which he makes a distinction. First in which he is drawing out the "Positive" truth asserted by each sect and party and distinguishing it from the portions of the system, which consist in denying truths asserted by others and secondly in which he is dealing with the actual order and constitution of the universal church and defending the position of the English church as having that order and constitution. [1]

Maurice looked much further afield, as is evidenced by his continuous opposition to the hide-bound Toryism of "Anglicanism". In disagreeing with one of his contemporaries, Owen, Maurice said:

> "Owen was in fact a state communist. The state cannot be a commune, never will be, never ought to be.....but the church was communistic in principle; the church brought into human society a spiritual fellowship and cooperation without which the state would soon disintegrate into a mere stock exchange." [2]

Again:

> "If by the Church I mean bishops, plus a certain number of dignified or undignified clergymen and certain

1. Ibid. p.336.
2. Miller and Fletcher. The Church and Industry. p 7.

> "representatives of the laity, the national society would answer well enough to my conception. I should say the Church had taken cognisance of the want of teaching in the country. But meaning by the Church, a Body, sacramentally united to Christ, this combination of Right Reverends and Reverends meeting in the sanctuary at Westminster to legislate for the people of England, is in my eyes a very secular body." 1

2. Church and State.

Maurice maintained that there was an Universal Church, which met men's demands for a spiritual and universal society, that nations were divinely ordered, that the universal church and the state, as representing the national society, should work together. It remained to be seen if the Anglican church offered signs that it belonged to the universal church and, if so, what were its relations to other religious organisations in England. Maurice declared that opinion was unanimous that the Anglican church existed in union with the state. Dissenters called it "an Act of Parliament Church." Romanists affirmed the anglican church had no right to call itself catholic, because it was a national body; civil rulers often exclaimed that they were impeded by the church; anglican bishops took part in the deliberations of parliament and the archbishop crowned the sovereign. [2]

Maurice differed from those, who held that as a national body, the anglican church could not call itself catholic. History showed that this church, which existed in union with civil institutions, had remained catholic through the Reformation period.

1. Op.cit. Life. vol 2. p 24.
2. Op.cit. Kingdom. vol 2. p 380.

While the nation had become protestant, the church had retained its catholicity. The catholic elements in the English church, however, enabled it to assert that, although a national church, it was also part of the universal church and could hold communion with other christian bodies on the basis of these catholic elements. The church of England also possessed all the signs of the universal society; baptism, creeds, forms of worship, the Eucharist, the ministerial orders, the scriptures. A church rested in the sacraments and orders. [1] He admitted that there had been anglicans, who desired to have the church rest upon interpretations of the sacraments and orders. Had they succeeded, the church of England would have become only another sect. But they had been unsuccessful and in consequence, bound to no system, the English church bore testimony to the existence of a divine universal order. Indeed, Maurice went as far as to state that the English church was the clearest witness anywhere of the existence of that order:

> "For this, (the truth that in the world there can be no communion, but in the the church, universal communion) our Church of England is now, I think, the only firm, consistent witness. If God will raise up another in Germany and elsewhere, thanks be to Him for it, but for the sake of Germans, Dutchmen, Frenchmen, Spaniards, Italians. For the sake of Baptists, Independents, Quakers, Unitarians. For the sake of man, I will hold fast by that church, which alone stands forth and upholds universal brotherhood, on the only basis on which brotherhood is possible." 2

Maurice thought that the Church of England embodied the ideas and principles of all other religious organisations without

1. Ibid. p 374.
2. Op.cit. Life. vol 1. p 166.

the opprobrious systems engrafted upon them. Her Articles and Liturgy, rather than serving as a basis for a church system had, according to Maurice, preserved the Church of England from becoming a system. [1] It would seem as if Maurice was inconsistent in his ideas, but it must be recognised that he viewed the formation of the Articles, the Prayer Book and even the Creeds as historic attempts to make the English church comprehensive. He could see only disaster in a separation of church and state. Each was:

> "part of the same constitution, both related to man under different aspects of his life; both bearing witness for God according to different aspects of His character; the one expressed in such institutions as property, which directly concerned him as a creature on this earth." [2]

Maurice was as ardent a nationalist as Coleridge. Like Coleridge, he thought of the nation as embracing all classes; like Coleridge, he felt that the age had lost sight of this view. [3] Maurice followed Aristotle, who held that there could be no adequate political philosophy without an ethical theory, no adequate political philosophy, which does not treat the state as a moral society, called into being by the fundemental needs of man's spiritual nature. [4]

3. Unity.

While the unity of christendom was a passion with Maurice that lasted throughout his life, as he grew older, he did not continue to think of the matter from a purely idealistic point of view. His mind quite naturally sought a more solid foundation than that. Basically he went back to the Incarnation

1. Op.cit. Kingdom. vol 2. p 402.
2. Ibid p 287.
3. Op.cit. Life. vol 1. p 203.
4. Peck W.G. The Divine Society. p 17.

for his premise. He tried in his tracts:

> "to prove that if Christ be really the Head of every man, and if He really have taken human flesh, there is ground for an universal fellowship among men." 1

It is the business of the Church to assert this ground of universal fellowship. Frederick Maurice, the son, relates the reaction of his father on learning of the action of Dean Stanley of Westminster in these words:

> "Yet the Dean of Westminster had administered the Communion to the whole body of the Revisers of the New Testament, including an Unitarian; my father's delight at his having done so, is expressed in many letters." 2

This would seem to indicate the lengths to which Maurice was willing to go in order to further the idea of unity.

2. Broad Church and Anglo-Catholic Party.

It might be well to state Maurice's views on "party". There were those, who desired to make a party leader out of Maurice., but the only body, which could be called the Broad Church party consisted of men, who did not agree with Maurice. He repudiated the idea of being called a Broad Churchman or any other designation, for he stated:

> "For there is not a journal from the Saturday Review to the Record, which does not speak of me as misty or mystical; and there is no charge so odious to every class of Englishman as that, What party in the Church, High, Low or Broad, would not disdain me as its representative?" 3

1. Op.cit. Life. vol 1. p 258.
2. Ibid. vol 2. p 617.
3. Ibid. " " .

It will be borne in mind, that any study and investigation in depth, into this field of party lines, has to do necessarily with the border country, where psychology, philosophy, literature, science, problems of social and economic reform and religion come together. Coleridge and his disciples among the Broad churchmen did not choose to accomodate themselves to the modern scholar, by keeping well within separate and distinct academic bounds. They pursued freedom, truth and unity, wherever the quest might lead. It is a field so vast that we must content ourselves with high-lights as they appear to us to be important within the scope of this paper. Although Maurice has been frequently spoken of as leader of the Broad Church School in the Church of England, and was considered by some of his contemporaries, both the founder of that school and the greatest Broad Churchman, his relation to the so-called "Broad Church Party" was far from simple. He steadfastly refused to accept the label for himself and to admit the need for a Broad Church Party. What the school stood for is as elusive of definition, furthermore, as his own thought was complex. [1]

> "I know Maurice well", said Mr. Gladstone, "had heard superlative accounts of him from Cambridge and strove hard to make them all realities to myself....I think he and other friends did me good, but I got little solid meat from him, as I found him difficult to catch and still more difficult to hold." [2]

Maurice himself stated emphatically, that his own "disease" was one which he had neither caught "by contact with any of the Broad Church School", nor communicated to them. He

---

1. Op.cit. Sanders. p 7.
2. Brookfield F.M. Cambridge Apostles. p 213.

steadfastly maintained this position, because in the first place, he feared either that the broad churchmen were already a party or that they showed a strong tendency to become one. He had always felt that to maintain the position of a true church he must be hostile to all parties. [1] A second reason for his refusal to join those, who preferred themselves to the broad churchmen is that he took them to be the sort of liberals, who cared little or nothing for the time-honoured beliefs and practices of the church of England, or for the study of theology. He supposed that the Broad Church was a representation, under different modifications, of that creed, "contained in Whateley's books", or of that which had arisen at Oxford "out of reaction to Tractarianism." [2]

To begin to understand Maurice's position, we must bear in mind that his church universal was conceived as resting upon eternal immutable truth. Each man, he taught, must seek out this truth for himself, by the power of his God-given reason. No man could receive it second-hand from a party or from any other intermediary. He could not create it with his understanding, or intellect, as many liberals would like to do. Since truth was eternal, it did not grow with time. The revelation of it, however, did progress from age to age. [3] The popular belief that God acted in an irregular manner, as in revivals, by occasional effusions of Grace, was repugnant to those, who had come under the influence of the modern principle, that the spiritual life is part of an eternal order and not at the mercy of the transient moods of the soul. Thus Maurice was only asserting another phase

1. Op.cit. Life. vol 1. pp 181.182.
2. Ibid. vol 2. pp 358.359.
3. Op.cit. Sanders. p 15.

of belief among those catholic Fathers, whom the Tractarians neglected, when he proclaimed that God had never ceased to make a communication to man; that now, as always, He revealed Himself, by the Law of His Being, in the reason, the conscience, the experience of humanity. To neither Pusey nor Keble was it given to read this law of the divine life in the order of nature or in the courses of history. [1]

Thus it may be seen on what broad foundations was the catholicity of Maurice laid. Nevertheless his steadfast refusal to be labelled a High or Broad Churchman is seen in his studies of Pusey's tract. It became more clear to him that it represented everything that he did not think and did not believe and thereupon made up his mind that it represented the parting point between him and the Oxford School. The distinction, incidentally, between his and Pusey's views was on the word Regeneration. The idea of Pusey being that of a change of nature, while Maurice regarded it as a coming out of the infant under the first influence of a light that had always been shining for it and all the world. [2]

Maurice opposed Roman Catholicism primarily because in his opinion, its principles were antagonistic to national distinctions:

> "The great virtues, which nations foster, distinct individual conscience, sense of personal responsibility, veracity, loyalty were undermined by Romanists, who did not recognise that unless there were national distinctions, the church would inevitably degenerate into a world empire." 3

He interpreted the trend to Roman catholicism as

1. Allen A.V.G. Continuity of Christian Thought. p 414.
2. Op.cit. Life. vol 1. pp 186.214.
3. Maurice F.D. Social Morality. p 180.

evidence that the theology of none of the church parties, dissenting or anglican, was able to satisfy the needs of their adherents, maintaining at the same time that he did not believe Roman theology would meet their needs either. In a letter to the Reverend R.C.Trench in 1841, Maurice wrote:

> "My own greatest anxiety at this time is to bring out the highest form of catholicity (not of anglicanism) as the direct opposite of popery and to show that popery is not the excess of everything good, but simply the denial of it." 1

He looked upon the ritualist as magnifying the Eucharist:

> "Their attempt to bring Christ back to the altar seems to me the most flagrant denial of the Ascension and therefore of the whole faith of christendom that can be imagined." 2

John Mitchell Kemble, one of the Cambridge Apostles, said of Maurice:

> "Maurice has determined to put his shoulder to the wheel and to stand up in these later days, as one of the Watchmen and Defenders. He has declared for the church in her catholicity.....If he only remains what I have known him to be, the church will rarely have possessed a braver or a more protecting champion. He is a man-of-war in the panoply of intellect and will." 3

During the various crises in the Oxford Movement, we find him from time to time endeavouring to bring the world back again to simple and trustful views:

> "Oh that our High Churchmen", he exclaims, "would but be catholic ! At present they seem to me three

1. Op.cit. Life. vol 1. p 321.
2. Ibid. vol 2. p 627.
3. Op.cit. Brookfield. p 209.

> "parts Papist and one part protestant, but the tertium quid, the glorious product of each element, so different from both, I cannot discern even in the best of them." 1

Charles Gore adds a singular note in acknowledging the greatness of Maurice:

> "So again, the church from the first has fasted. And the great authors of religious revivals in our church, Simeon and Pusey and Maurice alike practiced and encouraged fasting." 2

Wordsworth wrote:

> "In the course of time, both the radical and conservative elements of the Anglican church came to look on Maurice as their main source of inspiration. No better illustration of a common meeting ground of two seemingly opposed principles could be formed, than the fusing of the two extreme wings, the Broad Church and the High Church in their heritage from Maurice. His practical social theories appealed to the Broad Church, which has been chiefly stimulated by modern science, while his true christian ideals of brotherhood have been embraced by the High Church." 3

According to Strachey, Maurice looked with disfavour on the Oxford High Church party, because he considered it one-sided and:

> "under the destructive spirit of the age, at times endeavouring to pull down other men's truth because it is not the same position as their own." 4

He believed that truth flourished in an atmosphere of controversy. He wrote to Ludlow that truth should be expressed, examined and compared in all its different approaches. 5

1. Ibid. p 217.
2. Gore Chas. The Sermon on the Mount. p 116.
3. Op.cit. Miller and Fletcher. p 16.
4. Op.cit. Life. vol 1. p 205.
5. Ibid. vol 2. pp 391.392.

5. Christian Socialism.

Something has already been stated about the condition of the lower classes in England. To this will be added, that the condition of the people in 1842, as seen in the streets of Bolton, Lancashire, was described by Colonel Perronet Thompson (1783-1869) in language that palpitates with anger:

> "Anything like the squalid misery, the slow, mouldering, putrefying death by which the weak and feeble of the working classes are perishing here, it never befel my eyes to behold, nor my imagination to conceive. And the creatures seem to have no idea of resisting or even repining. They sit down with oriental submission, as if it was God and not the landlord that was laying his hand upon them." 1

Maurice saw this sort of thing on every hand, though perhaps not quite as bad as painted by Colonel Thompson and as he saw the condition of the masses he felt that most of their trouble was due to lack of education. Maurice had a great desire to "get at" the poor of the land.

> "Dissenters, socialists, discontented men of all sorts, yet I know they are here. I have no books, which I am satisfied to give them." 2

He proposed a series of Cambridge Tracts for such a purpose, but Archdeacon Hare frowned upon the idea indicating opposition to Oxford. Maurice gave way to Julius Hare's judgment. As an undergraduate at Cambridge, Maurice had attended Hare's lectures on Sophocles and Plato, said that to those lectures he could trace "the most permanent effect" on his character and on

1. The Cambridge Modern History. vol 12. p 730.
2. Op.cit. Life. vol 1. p 368.

all his modes of contemplating subjects, "natural, human and divine." 1 Maurice's scheme for educating the masses found its expression in a "Working-man's College". He had great hopes that in this way, if the movement extended to the university towns and the great commercial centres, a connecting bond between the university and the mass of the people might be found.

It requires no stretch of the imagination to observe that socialism stalks in the wake of poverty and hunger. In 1848 Ludlow, writing to Maurice said:

> "Socialism has become a powerful factor in the national life; it must be christianised or it will shake christianity to its foundations, precisely because it appeals to the higher and not the lower instincts of man." 2

If Ludlow was the founder of Christian Socialism, Maurice was its seer and prophet and Charles Kingsley its most brilliant interpreter. The Chartist risings, the conditions of workers in the factories in England, to which Shaftesbury had drawn attention. The famines in Ireland and the French Revolution all came to focus in 1848. After his visit to Paris, Ludlow, writing to Maurice of his impressions, told him that socialism had become a very great power and that it needed to be christianised. In reply Maurice said:

> "I have not time to tell you now what earnest thoughts you letter has awakened in my mind, that they had been working for a long time. I see that God Himself is speaking to us and that if we ask Him what He would have us do, we shall be shown." 3

In 1850, Maurice writing to Ludlow said:

---

1. Ibid. vol 1. p 55.
2. Op.cit. Miller and Fletcher. p 8.
3. Ibid. p 10.

> "Tracts on christian socialism seem to me the only title, which will define our object and commit us at once to the conflict we must engage insooner or later with the unsocial christians and the unchristian socialists." 1

The outcome of this was the starting of the society for the promoting of working-men's associations. This effort failed and was replaced in 1854 by the Working-Man's College, which has enjoyed an unbroken existence down to this present. It has had a marked influence on the adult education movement in England, in rousing the social conscience of the young men of that period to an interest, which found expression later in the university extension movement and social settlements. The debt of England to Maurice was very great. His repose of intellect, his genius for leadership, his great heart and human sympathy made his influence of a lasting character. Through his valiant effort the Church of England emerged from an attitude of indifference to one of genuine concern for the social problem. It could be said at this point, that John MacLeod Campbell called him, "The only man, who is attempting to deal with the mental difficulties of his generation in a free and fair spirit." [1] Julius Hare wrote in 1853: "I do not believe that there is any living man, who has done anything at all approaching to what Maurice has effected in reconciling the reason and conscience of the thoughtful men of our age to the faith of our Church." [2]

Maurice maintained the existence of the church under two aspects; one as a great educational organisation and the other as a great social organisation. On this thought he built his

1. Op.cit. Sanders. p 18.
2. Ibid. p 21.

scheme of Christian Socialism. [1] Beyond all things Maurice dreaded becoming head of even the christian socialists, with which he was to be so closely allied. His great wish was to christianise socialism, not to christian socialise the universe. Mr. Ludlow was very anxious that the word christian should be in some form so retained that it could be shown they were working on christian principles. Maurice's fear was the tendency to form a new sect. [2] In the Church of England the genesis of christian socialism reaches back to the threshold of the 19th century, to the French Revolution. The forerunners were Southey and Coleridge, who prepared the way. [3] Coleridge's influence was marked. His contribution to the religious opinion of England had placed the leaders of christian socialism under a particular debt to him. In this connection, of Coleridge, Canon Raven says:

> "Upon Maurice, he (Coleridge) was one of the three chief formative influences and probably the most important of the three; and Kingsley, if he owed more to Carlyle and was never really at home in metaphysics, yet reckoned Coleridge the founder of that school of recovered platonism of which he and his friends were members." 4

Maurice, it will be recalled was a Cambridge man and came under the strong platonic influence of Julius Hare. This point is made here, for later it will be seen that there came some valid criticism of the platonic school and its results in the field of christian socialism. It should be also stated at this juncture, that W.G.Peck, one of Maurice's admirers and mild critic, differing from the platonic school of thought stated :

---

1. Op.cit. Kingdom. vol 1. p 269.
2. Op.cit. Life. vol 2. pp 41.159.
3. Op.cit. Miller and Fletcher. p 6.
4. Peck W.G. The Social Implications of the Oxford Movement. p 221.

> "Maurice the great interpreter of the christian social movement in England, was likewise one of the great forerunners of adult education in that country. Without a program of adult education, the concept of the social gospel, would have been the longing of a few and never the expressed concern of the whole body of the church." 1

It is clear that neither Maurice nor Charles Kingsley were the founders of christian socialism, but John Malcolm Ludlow. Maurice was the one who formulated its ideology. Ludlow himself testifies to this. The weekly Bible meetings at Maurice's home, with Maurice as philosopher and interpreter, were, Ludlow stated "the very heart of the movement." The conviction that morality was basic to political economy was shared by most of the christian socialists. Certainly it was the basis of Maurice's thinking. Thomas Shorter, a former Chartist, asserted:

> "That is just our complaint against political economy so-called. That it has nothing to do with them (moral responsibilities); that it acknowledges no morality, but that of 'buying cheap and selling dear'; that it treats men as so much machinery, rather than as thinking, sentient, intelligent beings." 2

Ludlow thought socialism should commend itself to everyone because it took account of moral causes, which the economist neglected. Both Maurice and Coleridge thought alike on the social theory. Each social class in the nation had a divine function to fulfil; the aristocracy were witnesses for a continuous national tradition and the trading classes for the progressive nature of the nation. Each class was commendable as far as it

1. Ibid. p 222.
2. Op.cit. Life. vol 2. p 496.

confessed this ministry, ignominious as far as it sought power for itself. [1]

Coleridge had thought of the aristocracy, the mercantile class and the clergy, each holding legislative rights, as constituting a balanced order. however, as Maurice pointed out, since Coleridge's time, the commercial spirit had increased. The House of Lords had proved insufficient protection against the conflicting forces of trading interests. Accordingly, Maurice argued, a fourth group the working class, was needed to declare that the purpose of the nation was to promote the welfare of all. Maurice alone sought to align himself with the organised protests of the men most affected by the new industry. "Coleridge," states Gloyn, "had in his youth, lauded revolutionary activity, but this early enthusiasm for radical reform did not continue." [2]

The Tractarians regarded the protests of working men against their lot as sinful. Arnold denounced chartism. Maurice alone saw that organised labour should not be denounced but redeemed. The real significance of the christian socialist movement was, that it dared to include labour-organisation activity within the christian program. Maurice is also particularly significant in that he insisted that christianity should penetrate and reform the 19th century competitive economy. Coleridge protested against the exaggerated commercial spirit and its destruction of the harmony between social groups. The Tractarians accentuated the contrast between religion and secular life and pleaded that religion humanise economic relations. Arnold noticed

1. Op.cit. Life. vol 2. p 497.
2. Op.cit. Gloyn.p 185.

the widening breach between social classes, but was unable to prescribe a cure. All these men were content to set forth christian theories to guide the political and economic practices of the time. For them the prevailing political economy was not necessarily a false science, but a science of dismal motives. Only in Maurice was the challenge openly made:

> "Competition is a lie. The time has come for us to declare that it is a lie." 1

His challenge laid before the church the task of reconstructing society on a christian basis, rather than working out an approximation of christian living within a competitive economy.

D. The Theology of F.D.Maurice.

1. General statement.

Before reviewing the theology of Maurice, there should be something said concerning the various categories of maurice's thinking that throws some light on his theology and so conversely one can state that his theology was instrumental in directing the categories of his thinking in other directions besides theology.

Maurice was troubled by the universities. He had a desire to reform the education of the universities. Through this reform he believed men would seek education for itself and not for the emmoluments the church had to offer as a reward. This he believed would attract dissenters on the one hand and satisfy the many romanist cravings and would be a means of adopting the best part of romanism into our system, while it might be a most effectual

---

1. Ibid. p 301.

witness for protestant truths. [1] Back of this was the belief of Maurice, amounting to a possession, that the clergy had been dosing their people with religion, when what they needed was the Living God to save them from atheism. [2] Everything that Maurice wrote about education had as its great purpose, "to assert for theology its place as the scientia scientiarum." [3] In a letter to Mr Ludlow in 1848, Maurice asks the question:

> "Are we not atheistic ? Is not our christianity semi-atheistic ? We have theories of sin, of justification, of apostolic succession, schemes of divinity, Protestant, Romish, semi-Romish, Anglican and Dissenting. But where is God in them all ? Not first, at least not a Father, but merely the Provider of a certain scheme for our deliverance, the Setter-up of a church system, which is to go on without Him by help of popes, kings and doctors; the great assertion is that everyone is to think what he likes." 4

> "Church reformation therefore, in its highest sense I conceive involves theologically the reassertion of these truths in their fulness, apart from their calvinistic and tractarian limitations or dilutions. Socially, the assertion on the ground of these truths of an actual living community under Christ, in which no man has a right to call anything that he has his own, but in which there is spiritual fellowship and practical cooperation. Nationally, the assertion of an union, grounded not on alliances and compromises, but on the constitution of things." 5

The Record, (a High Church paper) accused Maurice of teaching infidelity, pantheism, sabellianism and universalism. Due to his accusation of universalism, a controversy arose in 1853 with Dr. Jelf on the question of endless duration of future

1. Op.cit. Life. vol 1. p 359.
2. Ibid. p 369.
3. Ibid. p 371.
4. Ibid. p 459.
5. Ibid. vol 2. p 9.

punishment. The position of Maurice therefore giving rise to the belief that he was an universalist. It is of interest to note what various men of letters had to say of Maurice. In a letter from Gladstone to Lord Lyttelton:

> "The motion carried is to the effect that the statements on certain points contained in Maurice's last essay are of a dangerous character and that his connection with the theology of the College (Kings) ought not to continue." 1

The Bishop of London stated as his opinion that Maurice was preaching dangerous doctrines, contrary to those of the Church of England. [2] Maurice's stand was:

> "I maintain that time and eternity coexist here."

Whereas others viewed eternity as the future state contrasted with the present. [3]

> "If you ask me," wrote Maurice, "what seems to me our duty as clergymen, I should say, first of all to preach continually the reconciliation of God to man and to take every opportunity of affirming that the Sabbath is a witness of it. Second, as to our Lord's words and works, they testify that the Sabbath is as dear to Him as are the mortals He healed. Third, to combat the notion that our Lord's words were suitable to His time, but not to ours, which is Latitudinarian, an accursed doctrine." 4

Maurice was equally emphatic in regard to the various sects. In a letter to Daniel MacMillan in 1843 he said:

> "It seemed to me poor work to say, 'there is something good or true in all sects', unless one found some method of ascertaining whereabouts the truth lay and how it became mixed with other ingredients." 5

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

1. Ibid. vol 2. p 195
2. Ibid. p 197.
3. Ibid. p 219.
4. Ibid. p 282.
5. Ibid. p 338.

Again:

> "I think the Church of England is the witness in our land against the sect principle of "forming churches', which is destroying us and the Americans too." 1

The history of theology in England, so far as it has been influenced by Coleridge and Maurice, who was his disciple, has been guided by the principle of Hegel, rather than that of Schleiermacher. Coleridge in his early life, while still under the influence of 18th century traditions, became an unitarian minister. But acquaintance with Schellings philosophy, which is akin in its theological bearings to Hegelianism, led him to see the larger relationahips of the Trinity to human reason, as well as to human life, so that a doctrine, which had seemed to him irrational or absurd from the standpoint of deism, became of vital importance in his maturer thought. In this respect Coleridge has been followed by Maurice, the greatest of English theologians. He too, fought his way through the representative struggle of the age, from deism to the christian idea of God. The application of the doctrine of the Trinity to the spiritual needs of man, or as the clew to the interpretation of human history, may be said to constitute the substance of Maurice's theology; more than any other modern theologian was he in accord with the fundemental principles of Hegel. It is this, which explains his obscurity to those not yet emancipated from deistic notions, or who regard the Trinity as an attachment to the idea of God, to which justice has been done in acknowledging it as a catholic tradition. It is

1. Ibid. p 300.

strange that Maurice should have given so little attention to the one man, whose philosophic thought he reproduced in its practical and religious bearings.

It is quite evident that not all of Maurice's theology was clear, even to as keen a thinker as Gladstone, even if he was a layman, as has been seen. [1] In a letter to the Hon. and Reverend G: Wellesley, Gladstone speaking of Maurice's dismissal from King's College, says:

> "Certainly there is a blinding power in theological rage, which often induces honest men to act like scoundrels. I must confess that Maurice's proposit - ions in my judgment do not hang together. He tells us that the will of God is for the salvation of all His creatures, all without exception and that he cannot but believe that Will must ultimately prevail. But on the other hand, he teaches eternal (though not everlasting) punishment; and he holds that eternity means fixity and is represented by a circle, though not by a line; and he says he cannot tell what amount of opposition obstinate wickedness may offer to the Will of God or (as I understand it) with what effect." 2

Maurice's entire realm of thought was burdened by the political, religious and social problems of the time, which he believed to be lack of theological principles and were not to be solved by any of the theories heretofore considered. In his opinion the necessary task was not to determine the basis of national life, church authority or church unity, as Coleridge, the Tractarians and Arnold respectively believed. All such efforts Maurice contended were of value, but insufficient; theological reform must precede any social reformation.

---

1. P 39. This paper.
2. Lathbury D.C. Correspondence on Church and Religion of Wm. E. Gladstone. vol 1. p 360.

> "Begin from God", said Maurice, "and every phase of life, political, religious and social, would find its proper relation to the others." 1

Maurice believed theological reformation necessary for several reasons. Unless a theological reformation took place, atheism could not be avoided, and without God, he thought, social order was impossible. [2] The only ground for certainty in morals, the only foundation for society, was in theology. He interpreted the 18th century as a century of destructive analysis; following it there had been attempts at synthesis, but too often the best of these attempts, as found in the writings of such men as Mill, Fourier and Humboldt, were in Maurice's opinion, the most dangerous, inasmuch as these excluded God. [3] England was rapidly becoming a commercial nation and Maurice concluded that unless society recognised the "unity of men in Christ," commerce must lead to murderous conflicts between labour and capital. [4]

Furthermore, Maurice thought a truer theology offered the only basis for a reconciliation of both the different religious sects and the opposing classes in society. He agreed with Thomas Arnold, that sectarianism was the bane of the Church:

> "The Church is in a sad state", he wrote to his former student Strachey in 1839, "little light, little life ....our great misery has been our resolute worship of our own notions, our hatred of every notion that clashed with them." 5

Maurice believed that each of the sects among Dissenters or Anglicans; there could be sects, he admitted, within the Church

1. Op.cit. Life. vol 2. pp 241.247.
2. Op.cit. Kingdom. vol 2. p 438.
3. Op.cit. Life. vol 2. p 137.
4. Ibid. p 459.
5. Ibid. vol 1. p 266.

of England; possessed some truth, but each was wrong, when having organised its partial truths into a system, denied that anything was given to men by tradition and revelation.[1] Church evangelism reduced to a system, denied the idea of church fellowship; catholicism, reduced to a system, denied national churches.[2] Maurice's thought was more theological than Coleridge's, but Maurice used the same concepts; the reason, which all men possessed equally enabling them to know spiritual truths; the understanding, which men possessed in differing degrees enabling them to weigh intellectual propositions; the unity of the whole man, by which reason works in harmony with other faculties; the appeal to internal evidence as the test of truth. Maurice acknowledged his indebtedness to Coleridge in the dedication of his work, "The Kingdom of Christ", to Coleridge. Other writers had taught that the highest truths were beyond the limits of experience. Coleridge, Maurice said, had applied these principles to theology.[3]

Before taking up in detail the theology of Maurice, a further word should be said. Men were the sons of God, they already had fellowship with each other. Just as they were in families and in nations, so they were in a society, which was spiritual and universal. This society, Maurice said, was described in the scriptures. The Old Testament forecast it; the covenant by which the Jews were to witness one God as the God of all nations, implied an universal kingdom. The Incarnation revealed in the New Testament showed that this kingdom was a reality. Pentecost disclosed that there was an universal society held together by the power, which bound men originally to God. The universal church,

1. Ibid. p 213.
2. Op.cit. Kingdom. vol 2. p 409.
3. Ibid. vol 1. p xxv.

with Christ as its Head, was there shown to be the universal society, which had been established for men in opposition to all worldly empires,

> "the highest part of that spiritual constitution of which the nation and the family are lower and subordinate parts." 1

Henry Sidgwick commented humorously upon Maurice's manner of solving difficult theological problems:

> "In Maurice's hands you feel like a horse being led up to a five-barred gate, which is your theological problem. How will you get over it ? Maurice shows you the gate, dilates upon its bars, its height, its insuperability, strokes your nose a little more and all of a sudden you find yourself looking at the gate from the other side. You know that you have not got over it legitimately but how you find yourself on the other side you do not know." 2

2. God.

The central thought in the theology which Maurice developed from the metaphysics of Coleridge, as has been said, was the appeal from man to God. Maurice conceived of God as Infinite Charity. When questioned as to the grounds for this belief, he replied:

> "The Bible and the Church speak to me of charity. My consciousness responds to that speech and so, I imagine, does yours." 3

If a man will but be true to the inward light in himself, he will know that God is Charity. His interest in Unitarianism, which, like Coleridge, he gave up without losing sight of all its teachings. Unitarianism, said Maurice, taught him

1. Op.cit. Social Morality. pp 232.306.
2. Sidgwick Hy. Contemporary Review. vol No. lxv. p 880.
3. Op.cit. Essays. pp 10.11.

to believe that God cannot be divided according to the diversity of His operations, but is essentially one; and that He must be the ground of all unity among men. [1] It also taught him, that one of God's attributes was "absolute and unqualified love." [2] From his father, he learned to dislike mere toleration, which the older Maurice took as implying a sense of superiority and sometimes of contempt towards what is tolerated.

Maurice called theology, "the protector and basis of morality and humanity." [3] The great aim of Coleridge and Maurice was to assert that the truth upon which the universe rests is not something, which men make with their minds, but that it is an invisible, immutable, infinite and eternal force, revealing a living God. Writing to Kingsley, Maurice said:

> "My sole vocation is metaphysical and theological grubbing....the treasures of earth and sky and air are not for me." 4

Maurice felt justified in spending a large part of his own time in searching for new meanings beneath old facts.

> "My business is not with new things, but I believe old facts may always be fresh and may give out a fresh meaning for each new generation." 5

Like Newman, he regarded the past as a vast repository of treasure, which should be searched through and sorted out according to their religious value. But with Newman, facts were valuable only in so far as they conformed with the teaching of an institution, while with Maurice they were valuable in so far as they revealed truth in its utmost depth. Like Coleridge, Maurice

1. Ibid. p 127.128.
2. Ibid. p 133.
3. Ibid. p 223.
4. Op.cit. Life. vol 2. p 295.
5. Op.cit. Sanders. p 226.

yearned for a God of many attributes. Three of them he dwelt upon especially: power, personality and love. Power, which he perhaps stressed more than Coleridge did, was sufficient in God to render man humble. God's personality was revealed in His Fatherhood. Maurice never tired of asserting that God was a Father, not a mere Inventor of theories and schemes of salvation.[1]

Indeed, Maurice's research showed clearly that he could not be strictly called conservative, if to be conservative means to prefer the past to the present. His veneration for history and tradition grew out of his belief that in the records of the past might be found, by diligent search, truth and laws, which were timeless and which were the source of each age's power. His teaching that eternal truth, no matter in what age it might be discovered was always available for present use, helps to explain how he, like Coleridge and Arnold, came to conceive of history, like metaphysics and philosophy, as a very practical study. Maurice's empirical trend is seen in his statement:

> "We have to find out that God is
> not in a book, that He is, that
> He must reveal Himself to us, that
> He is revealing Himself to us." [2]

Maurice revealed the depth and breadth of his views on the Godhead, in his claim that God must be in every phase of every man's life. In a letter to Ludlow, he said that the basis of the workingman's College should be neither secular nor in the narrow sense religious:

> ".....it must assert the principle
> that God is to be sought and honoured
> in every pursuit, not merely in something

1. Op.cit. Life. vol 1. p 459.
2. Ibid. Life. vol 2. p 445.

"technically called religion." 1

Maurice found two wrong tendencies in the 17th and 18th centuries, which he believed the reformation of the 19th century was to combat. One of these was towards the deification of the intellect. The 18th century, he said, after it had rejected the idea of a spiritual kingdom, sought to produce a comprehensive system of its own through the functioning of mere understanding. [2] The other wrong tendency, which was older than protestantism, was that toward excessive individualism. True, Maurice insisted that religion must be partly individualistic.

> ".....morality and religion being individual concerns, the less individual existence, in other words, the fewer thoughts and feelings a man has, the less he is a moral and religious being." 3

3. Christ.

Man finds the revelation of God in the Person of Christ, the Supreme example of the union of God with man. According to Maurice, this union existed prior even to the Advent of Christ. [4]

> "Christian theology does not speak of an Incarnation till it has spoken of 'an Only-Begotten Son, Begotten of His Father, before all worlds, of One Substance with Him.'" 5

Men have always been the children of God stated Maurice; they are condemned in so far as they do not acknowledge this and act as if it were true. Such a statement is open to the criticism that Maurice believed that the soul of man entered the child at birth (or at whatever period it did come into the child)

1. Ibid. p 319.
2. Op.cit. Kingdom. p 294.
3. Op.cit. Life. vol 1. p 82.
4. Op.cit. Essays. p 85.
5. Ibid. p 87.

pure, that is to say free from inherited sin. Such a theory left Maurice open to the charge of Socianism. To Maurice, Christ's task was not the reconciliation of a world, alienated from God, not only because men have always been the children of God, but because a saving revelation has pervaded human history from the beginning.

> "Man according to his original constitution was related to Christ."

Pfleiderer criticised his doctrine of Christ, for merging the "Christ in man with the historic Christ."

> "The cardinal contradiction", said Pfleiderer, "of making the eternal idea of humanity at the same time an historical individual of an absolutely supernatural nature, necessarily involved everywhere the diversion of all ideal speculative effort of thought into traditional super-naturalism." 1

Christ's task then was simply to reveal to men what has always been the fact, that men are in God. Here we see a very liberal tendency. Other liberal tendencies of Maurice's mind are manifested in his conviction that theology and history, important though they were, did not exclude other approaches to truth. Like Coleridge, Maurice welcomed all productive kinds of enquiry:

> "I do not think it dangerous that any man should get any knowledge of any subject whatever; the more he has the better." 2

In his christology, Maurice reconstructed the orthodox doctrine of the atonement. He denounced, as heathenish, the popular maxims of sacrifice. To suppose, he declared, that the

---

1. Pfleiderer O. The Development of Theology in Germany since Kant and its Progress in Great Britain p 377.
2. Op.cit. Essays. p 18.

punishment of sin has to be removed by the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross makes divine justice different from human justice, and substitutes deliverance from punishment for deliverance from sin.[1] By the Cross, Christ did not "win" something from God, which did not proceed from God's Will; did not suffer death to "satisfy" God's justice. Rather, the Cross displayed God's character. His self-sacrificing love, which men are to appreciate if they would realise their true selves. By this revelation of God's character, Christ became a source of self-sacrificing love in men and restored humanity to its true condition.[2]

> "The sense of our substantial union as men, with Christ and of His union with the Father sometimes comes to me with an overpowering conviction." [3]

4. The Holy Trinity.

Declared Maurice:

> "Our thoughts begin with a Father, that His Son our Lord is the ground of all the actual unity among men, without which there would be no families, nations, churches, humanity. The more have I been driven to the belief of a Spirit in whom the Father and the Son are One, and in whom their unity becomes known to us and the root of all conscious fellowship and self-sacrifice in us."

> "The terrible confusion, which has come to us from mixing partly the philosophy of Aristotle, partly the philosophy of the money market, with the message of the Son of God. When the Record calls me a Socinian, it tells a lie, a particularly broad and immense lie, but it indicates a fact in my history, which one of its editors happens to know and which I never wish to forget. I was bred an Unitarian."

---

1. Op.cit. Life. vol 2. pp 366.566.
2. Op.cit. Essays. pp 244.245.
3. Op.cit. Life. vol 2. p 326.

> "To realise the meaning of the name of the Father, the meaning of the Unity of God, is my calling and duty. I believe there cannot be a Father without an only-Begotten Son of the same Substance with Himself; that there cannot be any Unity, but the Unity of the Eternal Father with the Eternal Son in the Eternal Spirit."
>
> "I believe the Catholic faith, the faith in a Father, who so loved the world as to give His Son for it; in a Son, who because He is One with the Father and came into the world to do the Will of His Father, offered Himself freely as a sacrifice to redeem men from sin and to bind them to God; of a Spirit, who proceeds from the Father and the Son to bind all kindreds of men into a Divine Unity, has been underlying christendom, expressing itself in the universal baptism, in the Holy Communion, in prayers that carried men above all their notions and dogmas." 1

> "The Name of the Trinity, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, is, as the fathers said and the schoolmen said continually, the name of the Infinite Charity, the Perfect Love, the full vision of which is that beatific vision for which saints and angels long, even while they dwell on it. To lose this, to be separated from this, to be cut off from the Name in which we live and move and have our being, is everlasting death." 2

5. The Sacraments, Creeds, Bible, Prayerbook, Sin, Man, Eternal Punishment and Redemption.

Maurice's views of the sacraments appear to be far less "advanced" than some other theological points:

> "When any of us try to conceive a sacrament, we do, in the admirable language of our Article, 'destroy the nature of it.' The idea of a sacrament must always involve a paradox, the

1. Op.cit. Life. vol 2. pp 463. 472. 515. 570.
2. Ibid. p 413.

> "paradox of theology, the paradox of our human life. To bring it under the terms of a definition, to set it forth as a formula, is simply to take the sacramental essence out of it." 1

> "The creed is the document which has served as protection to the meaning of the scriptures against the tendency, which the church doctors in different ages have exhibited to disturb and mangle them; The creed has served as a protection to the humbler members of the church against the inclination, which the church doctors of different ages have manifested to rob them of their inheritance and to appropriate it to themselves." 2

Maurice's general approach to the Bible was practically the same as Coleridge's. The purpose of both was to discover its real values by critical processes and only by those, who had discerned the ways of the Spirit. [3] His valuation of the Prayer Book was similar to that of the creeds. The Prayer Book was a protection against all the "isms", High Church, Evangelical, Liberal or Rational. [4] In short, the English Church, when rightly understood, as a witness of the universal order, presented a basis for the unity of all christians.

> "The sin of man", said Maurice, "consists in the denial of his filial relationahip to God and .....of his own species." 5

Here we see that man is redeemed by recognising this relationship and living in the power which comes from such recognition.Redemption is an eternal fact or act, not something achieved only at a definite point in time by the sacrifice on the Cross. How Maurice reconciles this with the statement that "in the fulness of time" Christ came, he does not say. Such teaching

1. Ibid. vol 2. p 590.
2. Op.cit. Kingdom. p 277.
3. Ibid. p 405.
4. Op.cit. Life. vol 2. p 358.
5. Op.cit. Essays. p 226.

obviously controverted the accepted theologies of the period, based as most of these were on man's sinful nature. Maurice when asked for the best treatise on the nature of sin replied:

> "St. Paul's epistle to the Ephesians or in other words that method, which most clearly presents Christ in His spiritual exaltation is best fitted to reveal the nature, the extent and the enormity of sin." 1

The Tractarian and Calvinistic theologies, both taught that man had to become a child of God, in the one case by Holy Baptism, and in the other by conversion and a reliance on Christ's death as effecting a change in God's Will towards man. For Maurice man was already a child of God. He wrote:

> "Regeneration may mean the substitution in certain persons at some given moment, (say in the ordinance of Baptism, or at a crisis called conversion) of a nature especially bestowed upon them, for the one which belongs to them as ordinary human beings.....such a doctrine of regeneration.....is quite incompatible with the doctrine of the moralist, who supposes the human constitution...to be good and any violation of it and transgressions of it, to be evil." 2

Theology should begin, not with a fallen man of evil nature, but with man's divine nature as revealed by Christ. Not sin, but:

> "the living and Holy God" was "the ground of theology"; Sin was "the departure from that state of union with Him into which He has brought us." 3

Maurice believed this

> "fuller, more living theology." That mankind stood, "not in Adam but in Christ." Was the basis of all social and church reform. 4

---

1. Op.cit. Allen. Continuity. p 13.
2. Op.cit. Essays. p 223.
3. Op.cit. Life. vol 1. p 450.
4. Ibid. vol 2. p 358.

Such a reconstructed theology, as he envisaged, Maurice held, would reveal the inadequacy of all plans, aiming at social regeneration, which did not start with God. Such a theology would show that society was divine, as it stood, not as it might become; that men were already in union with each other by virtue of their being in Christ and Christ in them. Society was not to be made over by arrangements of men, but by discovering what was the order, of whose existence men's spiritual desires bore witness, in which that fellowship and brotherhood revealed by the Incarnation could find full expression. [1] From the theology of Maurice, one can appreciate its full social significance in respect to three cardinal precepts; man's spiritual nature, the reality of fellowship and redemption through recognition of man's essential divinity in the light of the example set by Christ.

Maurice held that man feels a sense of sin disturbing him and causing a consciousness of bondage. Yet always, along with the sense of sin, every man secretly believes that there is in him that which is not sin. Maurice saw man as a two-fold creature,

> "A spiritual being with an animal nature, who, when he has sunk lowest into that nature, has still thoughts and recollections of a home to which he belongs." 2

> "And from this comes the longing for a revelation that will show him why he has these intuitions, ever and anon, of the mercy and goodness of God, of thought of freedom and truth," 3

It is not hard to discern present day Unitarian teaching in his theology of man and his essential inate divinity. The seed is in man and perhaps even as a plant, all it needed was to be

1. Op.cit. Kingdom. p xlll.
2. Op.cit. Essays. p 63.
3. Ibid. p.91.

watered. There is in his theology of man something of an evolutionary process. As a matter of fact, the evolutionary hypothesis struck Maurice as illuminating and even attractive. He was filled with enthusiasm, when he ran across an antecedent of it in the writings of Albertus Magnus. The discovery seemed to him to bring the Middle Ages and the 19th century closer together in their belief.

> "It is a loving link to the old schoolmen of the Middle Ages, to see that in his monastery he was cherishing this genial faith, that he was preserving in his mind a sense of the harmony, which there is through all creation, of a golden chain, which unites the insect to the archangel." 1

In approaching the problems of evil, free-will, reward and punishment, Maurice followed Coleridge very closely. He identified all evil in man with selfishness. Christianity redeems man from his own selfish inclinations and restores him to fellowship with God and with man. Like Coleridge, he was not concerned how evil came into existence. Man's problem was to deal with it and not to explore its origin.

To Maurice, as to Coleridge, punishment was separation from God and the greatest reward was union with God. Neither of these had references to time:

> ".....eternal punishment is the punishment of being without the knowledge of God, who is Love & of Jesus Christ, who has manifested it, even as eternal life is declared to be the having knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ.....it has nothing to do with time or duration." 2

1. Maurice F.D. Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy. vol 1. p 602.
2. Op.cit. Essays. p 450.

Maurice said that Christ told, not of a future life, but of an eternal life. [1] Thus he sought to bring the church universal out of the future and far-away and to make it the source of all power in the practical concerns of day by day living.

E. The Influence of Maurice upon:

1. The Liberal Evangelical Group.

(a) Charles Kingsley.

Maurice's book, the Kingdom of Christ, came into the hands of Kingsley about 1842. It was the crisis of his life and he always said that he owed more to that book than to any he had ever read, for by it his views were cleared and his faith established. [2] In 1844, Kingsley met Maurice and the acquaintance soon strenthened into a deep and enduring friendship. In 1848 Maurice assisted Kingsley in setting forth new Tracts for the Times, which began with a handwritten poster, addressed to the workmen of England, calling upon them to assert themselves in their heritage and throw off the crushing yoke of selfish industry.

> "Maurice" said Kingsley, "has given me the highest proof of confidence, he is 'hauteur des circonstances', determined to make a decisive move against the chartists." 3

Maurice's Theological Essays, which caused his dismissal from King's College, had a profound effect upon Kingsley:

> "Maurice's Essays will constitute an epoch. If the Church of England rejects them, her doom is fixed. She will rot and die, as the Alexandrian did before her. If she accepts them, not as a 'code complete', but as hints towards a new method of thought, she may save herself still." 4

---

1. Op.cit. Life. vol 2. pp 137.138.
2. Kingsley, Mrs. Charles Kingsley His Letters and Memories of His Life. p 61.
3. Ibid. p 95.
4. Ibid. p 181.

Maurice's sermons, which Kingsley read, influenced him greatly against Calvinism:

> "I shall begin to regard Calvin as a child of the devil, and calvinism as the tree, which Satan planted in the Lord's garden at the Reformation to poison all within its shade. The influence of calvinism abroad seems to me to have been uniformly ruinous, destructive equally of political and moral life; a blot and a scandal on the Reformation; and now it has at last got the upper hand in England, can we say much for it.?" 1

Kingsley saw eye to eye with Maurice on the matters of science. In a letter to Maurice in 1863:

> "I am sure that science and the creeds will shake hands at last, if only people will leave both alone and I pray that by God's grace, perchance I may help them to do so." 2

At the time of Maurice's controversy with King's College, Dr. Jelf and others, he had much correspondence with the Bishop of London on the matter. Kingsley agreed with Maurice in the latter's correspondence with the Bishop of London, regarding the eternity of hell fire.

> "But if so", wrote Kingsley, "it must be a fire of purification and not of mere useless torment." 3

Kingsley had a tendency, as did Maurice toward universalism, or if not that, then both laid themselves open to criticism on the subject. Kingsley was very devoted to Maurice and revealed it in a most paternal way, when in a letter to Maurice in 1869, learning that Maurice was ill, he chided him thus:

---

1. Ibid. p 236.
2. Ibid. p 343.
3. Ibid. p 354.

> "You have enough and too much to do of your own. and either (1) You are necessary to Providence; and then you have no right to kill yourself by overwork, or, (2) You are not necessary to Providence and then you have no need to kill yourself by overwork." 1

(b) Arthur Penrhyn Stanley.

A theological storm was already gathering around Stanley. The same storm, that had already broken over Maurice, who was dismissed from King's College as Professor of Theology and of English Literature and Modern History; not for dogmatising on the question of the endless duration of future punishments, but for protesting against all dogmatism on the subject. Stanley ran afoul of the Tractarians, who took exception to his liberal views. In a letter from John Keble in 1856, relative to Stanley's famous book, "Sinai and Palestine", Keble says:

> "While I love it for the deep love, which it seems to me everywhere to breathe of Him, whom we all wish to serve, it fills me with regret, more than I can express, to see that in no part of all your book is His Person spoken of as properly Divine; rather, that the tone and language of it seems, as by a kind of instinct to avoid any such assumption, and to shrink from setting Him forth as more than a Perfect Man." 2

Pusey in a letter to Stanley says:

> "Only in the Sinai and Palestine, I see the shrinking from the mention of miracles, which in the next generation develops into the unbelief of them." 3

Bishop Colenso of Natal had written a book, which in effect was a negative attack on the Pentateuch. It was about to

1. Ibid. p 399.
2. Prothero R.E. The Life and Correspondence of A.P.Stanley. vol 1. p 481.
3. Ibid. p 508.

be published, but through the influence of Stanley, in view of the proposed resignation of Maurice from the incumbency of St. Peter's, Vere Street, due to unfavourable criticism of his own theological position, Colenso was persuaded not to publish his work for the time being.

> "Your work", wrote Stanley, "appearing in the midst of the storm of Maurice's resignation, would be doomed to certain misconstruction and would be condemned before it could be read." 1

The tenor of the times may be seen in Stanley's attempt to liberalise the Church of England, through his office as Dean of Westminster Abbey. Pusey gave the signal for an offensive and defensive alliance, between High and Low Churchmen. At a meeting held in Oxford, a declaration of Faith was formulated, declaring:

> "Our firm belief that the Church of England and Ireland, in common with the whole Catholic Church, maintains without reserve or qualification the inspiration and divine authority of the whole canonical scriptures, as not only containing, but being, the Word of God; and further teaches, in the words of our Blessed Lord, that the "punishment" of the 'cursed', equally with the 'life' of the 'righteous' is 'everlasting'", 2

The document was sent around to every clergyman in England, Wales and Ireland, accompanied by a letter entreating him to sign it, "for the love of God." At this juncture, Stanley invited representatives both of the High Church and Evangelical parties, asking them to preach at the special services, which he was preparing to hold in the Abbey on Sunday evenings. The leading Low Churchmen accepted his invitation, but Keble, Pusey

1. Ibid. vol 2. p 105.
2. Ibid. " p 158.

and Liddon declined. They declined, because of Stanley's attitude toward ecclesiastical and religious questions of the day. The correspondence of that day shows how deeply and widely the High Church party diverged from Stanley's views, despite his ardent desire for "the enlargement of the Church." In an interview Stanley had with Pope Pius IX, the Pope asked:

> "You know Pusey ? When you meet him, give him a message from me, that I compare him to a bell, which always sounds to invite the faithful to church and itself, always remains outside." 1

On Gladstone's recommendation Temple was appointed to the Bishopric of Exeter. Of this Stanley wrote in 1869:

> "Pusey has gone so far to assert that the choice was the most frightful enormity that has ever been perpetrated by a Prime Minister." 2

Stanley travelled in the path of Maurice and both of them, show that what catholicity they possessed was so broad as to be possibly misconstrued for liberalism. We shall have to make up our minds later about this in our summation.

(c) Frederick W. Robertson.

Robertson has been called a follower of Maurice, but he stood very much alone, holding Maurice in veneration, he differed on many important points from both he and Kingsley. He was the child of no theological father. At the age of twenty one, Robertson considered joining the Tractarian party, but after reading Newman's "Sin after Baptism", and a critical study of the Book of Acts, led him to think Newman in error and Robertson

---

1. Ibid. vol 2. p 358.
2. Ibid. " p 371.

refuted Newman's arguments. Carlyle influenced him in his reading, thus in some respect coming under a mind, that had also had an influence upon Maurice. He accepted the Tractarian view that all baptised persons were children of God, but had no sympathy with the evangelical view, which left it doubtful, whether the baptised child was a child of God or not. There seems to be no leaning of Robertson toward the Maurician view, that all society is divine and only needs to realise it.

In 1848, he took up the cause of the Workingman's Institute. Any man in that day, sponsoring the cause of the Chartists was considered as dangerous, as one who desired the overthrow of aristocracy and the monarchy. A letter from Maurice written in 1851 and another in 1854, prove that while Robertson wished Maurice and Kingsley God-speed in their work of christian socialisation, neither adopted the views they then held, nor gave his personal sanction to the means they employed. [1]

In a letter dated 1851, Robertson received a long visit from Maurice. He wrote:

> "His countenance is benign, full of thought, marked with sorrow, but conquered sorrow." 2

In Maurice he read large powers of sympathy with humanity. Due to the development of his own thoughts and life freely, Robertson was charged by his opponents with faithlessness to the Church and with Latitudinarian opinions. But he rejoiced in finding within the Church of England, room to expand his soul and freedom of thought. Factually speaking Robertson can hardly be

---

1. Brooke Stopford A. Life and Letters of F.W.Robertson. p 231.
2. Ibid. p 252.

said to be a follower of Maurice. He possessed, as did Maurice, a great soul and whether Maurice's ideology had made an impression on his mind sufficient to find its expression in the lot of the poorer classes, Robertson has not said. It is probable that to some extent this was so, and since Robertson died at such an early age, he had not reached that time of life, where a man looks back and gives credit, in his reflections, for the impetus he received in this or that direction. That he was interested in the lot of the working man no one will gainsay. Whether that interest began from any impact of Maurice, or was the fruit of his own thinking, neither his theology nor his writings have given any evidence. We do know that the Church lost a greatly expanding mind in the premature death of this promising churchman.

In a number of respects there were similarities between Maurice and Robertson. Like Maurice, Robertson was not a party man; he subscribed to no party shibboleth and accepted no party whip; standing outside the great organised factions, whose internecine conflicts then distracted men's minds and confused their consciences he was for the most part ignored, as well as disliked during his lifetime. He started with no special advantages of birth or wealth; he gained none of those academic distinctions, which sometimes take their place; he won the patronage of no great man and secured the public interest by no great book; he received no preferment; he formed no party; he never preached to the Court; no bishop complimented him with a chaplaincy; the only honorific position Robertson ever held was that of High Sheriff's chaplain;

he was the recipient of no honorary degree. Even the innuendos and criticisms, which he felt so deeply and which his friends resented so bitterly, do not seem to have attracted much attention outside the little canting world of Brighton gossip. It is one of the paradoxes of his ministry that his real fame began only after his death.[1]

(d) Phillips Brooks.

Phillips Brooks was born at a time, when the orthodox faith was fighting its bitterest battle with Unitarianism. His parents became Unitarians and had him baptised by an Unitarian minister. The parents, thrown back later for spiritual support upon evangelical doctrines, became Episcopalian, in which Church Brooks the boy received all his early training. In his later life, he declared that the Episcopal Church could reap the fruits of the long and bitter controversy, which divided the New England Church only as it discerned the worth of Puritanism and the value of its contributions to the history of religious thought and character. Subsequent influences upon his life tended to foster this liberal spirit. From the intellectual atmosphere of Harvard to the Seminary at Alexandria, Va, was an abrupt transition, the latter being uncompromisingly hostile to all views it considered as heterodox. This did not suit Brooks.[2]

No books in Brooks' library show signs of harder usage than Bushnell's sermons for the New Life and Maurice's Theological Essays. In the decade of the fifties in the last century, no writers were exerting stronger or more beneficient effect upon theology. Brooks' work resembles that of Maurice in the effort

1. Smyth, Charles. The Art of Preaching. p 225.
2. Encyclopedia Americana. 1940.

to hold in equilibrium these tendencies, which, existing apart, constitute the two wings of New England Puritanism. Maurice was the writer with whom Brooks was in deepest sympathy. He began to study his writings, when at the theological seminary; in his last years he recommended him to young men as the greatest theologian of the age.

During Brooks' incumbency at Trinity Church, Boston, there was at first an inclination on the part of the Unitarians to claim him as their own. Such power, such genius, marked him as of necessity one, who though he might not be conscious of it, must be at heart an Unitarian. They were unfamiliar with the breadth of the national Church of England; they were indifferent to Maurice, and Stanley and Arnold, Kingsley, Robertson, Thirwall, Tait and Temple, who represented liberal theology in the English Church, with whom Phillips Brooks was affiliated in spirit and at whose feet he had sat as a pupil. [1]

Not only were the Unitarians puzzled. The orthodox or Trinitarian Congregationalists were likewise puzzled. The Unitarians watched him to see whether he were orthodox and the orthodox were curious to see if he were an Unitarian in disguise.[2] While he regarded himself as an Evangelical or Low Churchman, he found himself out of sympathy with the Evangelical Educational Society. His opposition was based upon the test questions a prospective candidate for a theological scholarship had to answer before receiving a grant. These questions of course being given to show that the candidate was in sympathy with evangelical tenets.

---

1. Allen A.V.G. Life and Letters of Phillips Brooks. vol 2. p 137.
2. Ibid. p 140.

Brooks was in sympathy with the custom of inviting members of other religious denominations to remain to the Communion. He very naturally ran afoul of the High Church Party. Dr. Tulloch, whose book "Movements of Religious Thoughts in Britain, during the 19th Century", has been used in this paper relates:

> "I have just heard the most remarkable sermon I ever heard in my life....from Mr. Phillips Brooks, an Episcopal clergyman here;.....I never heard preaching like it.....I could have got up and shouted." 1

At the consecration of the new Trinity Church, Copley Square, many clergymen of other denominations were present and among them were eminent Unitarian Divines, all of whom had been personally invited to remain for the communion. Brooks thus showed he was in sympathy with Dean Stanley in administering the Communion to Dr. Vance Smith an Unitarian minister, in Westminster Abbey. The truth, which controlled and was basic to Brooks' thinking, is summed up in a few words, "truth is contagious through personality." [2] He followed Maurice in believing that all men alike everywhere inherited in virtue of their birthright the privilege to pray, "Our Father which art in heaven."

> "Surely we cannot be wrong", he wrote, "if we say positively that to Christ Himself the truth that man was God's child by nature, was the great fact of man's existence." 3

In the social aspect of christianity, Brooks was alive to its importance in his treatment of the "Influence of Jesus on the Social Life." Here he takes the Madonna, prominent in

---

1. Ibid. p 247.
2. Ibid. p 337.
3. Ibid. p 347.

ecclesiastical art, as the true type of the christian religion, rather than the sphinx, calm and eternal in its solitude.[1] The theology of Brooks is difficult of definition due to its devotional aspect.

> "Man", he says, "does not reach the idea of God by any conscious process."

Man' original knowledge of God may be found in the sole primal cause of which he has any knowledge, which is Will.[2]

As to the Person of Christ, he says:

> "The POSSIBILITY of such supreme manifestation of God in Jesus must lie in the essential nearness of humanity to Divinity." 3

There seems to be no place in Brooks' theology for Christ as the "Lord of Glory." Even as Keble to Stanley.[4] He speaks of the "uniqueness" of Christ[5] and the question arises whether Christ in His uniqueness is singled out above all men, or whether He is indeed Deity. There seems to be little of the sacrifice of Christ for the sin of mankind in Brooks' doctrine of the Atonement. Quite evidently he looks upon man as being "in Christ", rather than "in Adam", as did Maurice.

> "The Idea of Jesus is of a true personal moral life for every man, which belongs to every man as the son of God, to which by his deepest nature every man tends, from which sin hinders him, into which he is to be set free." 6

His views on the Sacraments are quite opposed to the Catholic view:

> "The sacraments in their largest view

1. Ibid. p 351.
2. Ibid. p 472.
3. Ibid. p 475.
4. P 70. this paper.
5. Op.cit. Allen. Life. p 478.
6. Ibid. p 480.

> "are human rites, that is, they indicate the universal facts of humanity." 1
>
> "Baptism", he says, "is the declaration of the universal fact of the sonship of man to God." 2

In this he echoes Maurice's thought that every man is in Christ and all he needs to do is to realise this sonship. In the largest survey we can take of Brooks' theological position, he appears as solicitious that the freedom of inquiry, which has been gained, shall not be imperilled by the dangers that wait on liberty. A distinguished Unitarian clergyman, who held Brooks in high esteem, says of him:

> "He was not a theologian, as Jesus was not.....Had he been a man of an intellectual caste, he might have wavered in his faith." 3

Brooks believed in tolerance; He was invited to read a paper at General Theological Seminary. He took for his text a passage from the writings of Maurice:

> "It is the natural feeling of all that charity is founded upon the uncertainty of truth. I believe that it is found on the certainty of truth." 4

His subject was Tolerance !

He brooded over the mystery of the Incarnation. He read literary art of all kinds to express his thoughts:

> "Oh, to preach a great sermon on the Incarnation !"

is an aspiration found in one of his sermon note books.[5] It was said of Wm. E. Gladstone, that when he was asked , what the foundation of his faith and hope was,

1. Ibid. p 482.
2. Ibid. vol 3. p 76.
3. Ibid. " p 77.
4. Allen A.V.G. Phillips Brooks. p 436.
5. Op.cit. Allen. Life. vol 3. p 103.

he replied, "The doctrine of the Divinity of Christ." That would not have been quite the answer of Phillips Brooks. With him it was not a doctrine concerning Christ, but Christ Himself. [1] As Maurice had grounded his theology upon the Trinity, so did Brooks:

> "If a man does believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, he ought to rejoice and glory in his faith as the enrichment of his life. It is the entrance to a land where all life lives at its fullest, where nature opens her most lavish beauty." 2

As evidence of his lack of sympathy that Brooks held for the High Church Party, he accepted Duns Scotus, who had made assault, in the Middle Ages, on the intellectualism of Thomas Aquinas, thus beginning the decline of scholastics in theology. Allen states:

> "It is difficult to classify Phillips Brooks in his theological attitude, because he is unlike any theologian with whom we may compare him. In giving the prominence to the will in Deity and in humanity, he resembles Calvin and Augustine, a possible inheritance, also, from his Puritan descent. But on the other hand he was emancipated from every trace of the doctrine of election, whether ecclesiastical or individual, whether through the Church by Baptism, or by the action of special Grace in conversion. In the prominence, which he gave in his preaching to the conviction that all men are the children of God, by creation and by redemption, he departs from the teaching of Calvin and Augustine; going back to the earlier theology, which in its comprehensiveness regarded all humanity as the Body of Christ; refusing to reduce the Body of Christ to the Catholic Church." 3

---

1. Ibid. p 105.
2. Ibid. p 107.
3. Ibid. p 125.

As in Maurice, so in Phillips Brooks, there emerges a peculiar type of mysticism springing out of the consciousness of oneness between the divine and the human will.

On the election of Brooks to the Episcopate of Massachussetts, a great controversy arose concerning his fitness theologically. It was claimed he had expressed his disbelief in the historic episcopate, that he deemed the miracle to be unimportant and in the life of Christ unessential. In a letter to his brother John, he wrote:

> "I thank you most heartily for your good letter. It is indeed a ridiculous pother that is going on, but it has this advantage, that it is bringing out the whole matter into broad daylight, and the decision, when it comes will have its full value, and when a distinct Broad Churchman, thoroughly recognised and proclaimed as such is made a bishop." 1

(e) William Temple.

William Temple in his early surroundings was quite evidently brought up in a school of thought, antithetical to the conservatism of the day. It has already been said that Pusey protested in most vigorous language at the appointment of William's father to the bishopric of Exeter. [2] The present Archbishop is a man of great breadth and depth. In some respects he is not unlike Maurice, of whom Gladstone said he was "difficult to catch and still more difficult to hold." [3] Temple, like Maurice uses every avenue of knowledge for the furtherance of the knowledge of the gospel to men living in a highly scientific

1. Ibid. p 438.
2. P 73. This paper.
3. P 40. This paper.

age, yet he has a firm grip on the living essentials of the christian faith.

There seems to be no direct evidence of Maurician influence and yet through all his writings, there runs a thread that bespeaks of an intimate knowledge of the theological and social position of the neo-Thomist school of thought. Perhaps like Maurice, who said of Coleridge, that it was from him that he was trained in the art of thinking, so may it be said of Temple in regard to the influence Maurice has had inductively, upon the the thinking of the present Archbishop of Canterbury.

> "Morality as I understand it," said Temple, "requires me to love my enemies. Well I cannot.....as long as I simply sit still and think about the sufferings of my fellow-creatures, I do find a very strong impulse to do something for them, not often strong enough to lead to action, but none the less quite perceptible. But when I actually meet the man, sometimes, at least all impulse to do anything for him vanishes at once.....what we want is precisely a change of will." 1

One can almost hear Maurice speaking, when Temple declared:

> "The teaching of the divine Fatherhood of God does contain a very strong element of judgment, because it condemns what is always our natural attitude toward God .....We are to love our enemies in order that we may be children of the Father, who is in heaven, who is indiscriminating in His love, making His sun to rise on the evil and the good and sending the rain on the just and the unjust. We are to be perfect in the way that our heavenly Father is perfect." 2

---

1. Temple Wm. The Kingdom of God. p 60.
2. Temple Wm. Basic Convictions. p 28.

Maurice found truth in every avenue of thought, which gave to him the undying breadth of his thinking.

> "Truth is truth", said Temple, "wherever you go. The gospel is true for all, if it is true at all; and, if so, then upon whomsoever has received it lies the inescapable obligation to impart it to others." 1

Temple believes heartily in the unity of society:

> "The third principle, the unity of all men in the 'family' of God, points to an organisation of life, which draws together in relations of mutual support the largest practicable number of persons." 2

In the chapter, "Evangelism in our Time", the breadth of his thinking is shown, when he makes two statements:

> "(1) So we come to the essential evangelistic appeal, which never varies: it is the appeal of Christ on the Cross, to all mankind and to each man and woman to be reconciled to God. 'We are ambassadors on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating by us; we beseech you on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God."

Again:

> "(2) We can see this happening before our eyes today. The Church is growing now, and for the last forty years has been growing, faster than at any previous period in its history. And where it grows, it creates fellowship. The true fellowship between Chinese and Japanese christians at this moment is itself a most moving evangel witness." 3

---

1. Ibid. p 70.
2. Temple Wm. The Hope of a New World. p 94.
3. Ibid. p 115.

The words of Mrs Hamilton King in "The Disciples" may well sum up the christology of William Temple:

> "For God has other words for other worlds;
> But for this world, the word of God is Christ....
> So that for ever since, in minds of men
> By some time instinct this life has survived
> In a religious immemorial light,
> Pre-eminent in one thing most of all;
> The Man of Sorrows; and the Cross of Christ
> Is more to us than all His miracles." 1

2. The Liberal Catholic Group.

(a) Henry Scott Holland.

Bishop Gore stated:

> "There is no doubt that Holland was the centre of the movement (christian socialist union) and that the movement expressed a central element of his mind." 2

Writing to Canon Richmond, Holland said:

> "We live in economic blindness down here, of the blackest kind. The world seems to have reacted into the mind of forty years ago. You would think it had never talked democratic language. We are in a mad back-water, eddying furiously." 3

The motive of the new Society under the churchmanship of Holland was the realisation that:

> "Christianity and especially the Church of England had failed to bear witness to the principles of Divine Justice and human brotherhood, which be at its heart." 4

In order to get a clear light on the extension of Holland's thinking, as it related to mankind, it will be necessary to look a little closer at his theological background.

---

1. Temple Wm. Nature, Man and God. p 511.
2. Op.cit. Miller and Fletcher. p 18.
3. Ibid. p 19.
4. Ibid. p 21.

A very slight acquaintance with Holland's writings would make it for ever impossible to connect him, even for a moment, with anybody or anything second-hand, or tame, or platitudinous or outworn. His mind was incredibly vigorous, versatile, ready and plastic. He felt by a secret intuition, whither the currents of modern thought and feeling were tending; but instead of showing a shallow kind of sympathy by reluctantly changing his own point of view, he gripped anew the primal spiritual fact, as did Gore later, "The Word was made flesh," for therein he showed in countless utterances, by his life no less than by his speech, that for him and all of us, all joy, hope, fear and love of God and man was planted and grew from the renewal of humanity by Jesus Christ and from the redemption of the world, which He accomplished on the hill of Calvary.

It seems more probable that Holland began with the conclusion and worked backwards; like Euclid, an author in most respects strikingly dissimilar. We should imagine Holland contemplating the familiar truth that each man's deepest, most living convictions are the outcome of his experience; and if they refer to spiritual matters, things that are unseen and eternal, the experience must have been spiritual too. In this discourse the author only advances in his main argument to the threshold of religion, relying on the kind of experience afforded by a sense of remorse. His thesis being that reason interprets the past and thereby gives power of anticipating the future.

Holland describes the reaching out of the soul as it

passes beyond the fleshly limits into the mystery of the unseen and finds in its ecstacy, the knowledge which in that dim, but glorious region becomes steady, certain and permanent. This is religion and it is inevitable that as the whole man is concerned in it; reason and as Holland said:

> "part and parcel of that wholeness, which is the man, should have its say about that action.....in which it has already borne its share." 1

To the question, which arises at this point as to the relation between faith and reason, Holland gives the following answer:

> "It is not far from outside or incidentally, that thought touches the works of faith; it penetrates the whole mass; it is woven into the fabric itself; it is inherent in the structure, in the constitution, in the material. Its office is to disclose this its pre-existent presence, to unfold its secret prevalence." 2

Holland was possessed and inspired by the belief in the Holy Spirit's presence in our hearts and His power to act depending on the strength and genuineness of men's desires. His view of life was throughout supernatural; that is to say, whatever good is done on earth is done by God, but that man prevents God from acting for our salvation, if he is acquiescent in all the heart-rending facts of life, which manifests the grip still maintained on the world by the kingdom of evil.

Man does not save the world, for he cannot even begin to wish to save it until God moves him by implanting in his heart right desire. If God is first, then God's action is everything.

---

1. Littleton, Reverend the Hon. Edward. The Mind and Character of Henry Scott Holland. p 69.
2. Ibid. p 70.

Man's part is not to act independently of God, or to earn forgiveness by good works; but to grasp the fact that God has redeemed the world and to bear witness to Him. Hence for any christian there can be no such thing as social reform independently of this underlying fact, that the world is potentially transformed, and that as that truth is brought home to each heart, actual transformation is brought nearer than before. Social reform, then, means making such readjustments as will help man's beclouded heart to welcome the Holy Spirit's work; the work of bringing home to it the ineffable truth of redemption; that is, of quickening him with the new divine life. If it is a fact that God is engaged in transforming the world, then clearly everything depends on man learning to drink the truth and live by it.

Holland's entire devotion to fact and experience sundered him utterly from these writers, to whom certain statements in the gospel narrative are neither to be denied nor affirmed, but left in a kind of suspense-haze. Again, his extraordinary sympathy with the forward movement of contemporary thought makes it impossible to indentify him for one moment with those traditionalists who have hoped against hope that they may be left secure in their reliance on the inability of science to explain any miracle. He gleefully caught at any new discovery for which the evidence was thought by good judges to be inadequate. Hence he stands out as a triumphant witness to the congruence of two convictions, which are constantly affirmed

by writers of both schools to be incompatible; namely, an unshakable hold on the affirmations of the Nicene Creed; and a readiness to restate the fundementals of the traditional faith with a superb freshness and most convincing power.

It is therefore impossible to classify him either as a modernist or a traditionalist. His creed embraced all that is vital to both, and he penetrated too deeply to be labelled either the one or the other. In short, if we consider the tone of a majority of writers on the subject of miracles, we shall see that far too little regard is paid to the grand fact generally admitted by both sides; to wit, that we are considering the effects of the divine life touching the human; and how that it is sheer presumptuousness to assume, that the limitations of earth circumscribe the actions of the Creator. [1]

His contribution to the fascinating question of the value of history is characteristic and important. He points out that of all ancient peoples, the Jews were the only ones, who wrote anything worth calling history at all:

> "The Arabs," he says, "cared nothing for their own past; the Egyptians' records only amount to the 'annals', bare records of dynasties, containing no enquiry into causes. Of the Greeks we have Herodotus concentrated on one great theme, but with no conception of the meaning of anything beyond. Thucydides was a 'shrewd critic' of national motives. He analyses what had led to disaster and demoralisation. But the Jew, alone among the civilised or half-civilised peoples, he discerned the purpose of the Creator in the providential government and discipline of mankind." [2]

1. Ibid. p 134.
2. Ibid. p 176.

In this Holland was led by his predecessor Maurice, who as professor of history in King's College, held similar views. On miracles Holland held a wide view, as did Maurice:

> "The supernatural, can never find itself or justify itself except from out of the existing situation. It must have its roots in reality." 1

Ordinarily this is put differently. God only reveals himself through man or through nature. Reality appears to mean, not the transcendent thing above and behind phenomena, but the world and society as we know them.

> "A miracle then, is the Beyond's answer to nature's yearning, the demand for the Higher Power to interpose is never outgrown, therefore to strip religion of the supernatural is to strip it of its essence." 2

Holland followed Maurice also, in his desire to see people more vigorously-minded. He insisted on the plain truth unacceptable to our generation, that reform and recovery must be preceded by a firmer grip on fundementals; not merely repeating the wailing of the down-hearted; "We want a new spirit", but showing that this new spirit vague and celestial, as it seems to our straining eyes, can be and must be laid hold of by men and women, who are willing to make mental and spiritual effort; the kind of effort, which is least congenial to the average person of today.

For sheer torrential eloquence, for an almost over-powering yet deeply intellectual vitality, Holland has no equal in

---

1. Ibid. p 178.
2. Ibid. p 180.

the English pulpit.

> "The last thing that was possible in Holland's presence," writes Dr. Lyttleton, "..... was inertia of the mind." 1

Holland had among other gifts a genius for putting the case against himself, stating it better than it had ever been stated, making it look more true and more attractive than it had ever looked. The fault of his style is its exuberance; an exuberance which, even in the reading, tends to disguise the intellectual structure of his sermons, the severely thought-out reasoning, the admirable lucidity of arrangement in balance, proportion and artistic finish.[2]

(b) Charles Gore.

Gore believed, as did Maurice in the greater catholicity of the Anglican Communion:

> "If Romanism," said Gore, "cannot be accepted as the whole of catholic christianity, and the Eastern churches do not claim more than their own territory, and the protestant reformation, so far as it broke with the structure of the catholic church, violated a divine law, which in the course of time increasingly vindicates itself, then the Anglican Communion, for all its defects and short-comings, has a great vocation. Our communion is much criticised and disliked, not without cause. But there is also a wonderful convergence of interest in it, among those, who ponder the problem of unity and who cannot believe that the Roman spirit is the whole spirit of christianity.
>
> "When we look beyond our borders and ask ourselves what we ought to be doing towards the recovery

1. Ibid p 52.
2. Smyth Charles. The Art of Preaching. p 234.

> "of the christian communion, I do not think that we shall be encouraged to believe that any project of 'corporate reunion' is at all near to realisation at present. But if we repent, each within his own communion, of our sins against unity, and the short comings of our own part of the church, we shall lose our narrowness. We shall become conscious how far our own communion is from having or being all that is catholic." 1

Here we see a churchman of great intellect, virtually a "sounding board" for the thought of Maurice, as expressed almost a century before.

The words of Gore regarding his attitude toward christian socialism require little comment, except to say, they reflect in no small measure, the enlarged conception of the duty of the Church toward the masses.

> "Also it must be recongised, that within the region of the economic and political life of the nation the last ninety years, since the beginning of the chartist movement have been years of an advance towards democracy, which, as far as the political vote is concerned has been completely victorious, and in other respects also has led to conspicuous results." 2

> "The profound element of weakness in our present industry is that the industrial workers in general, do not feel that their occupation can claim the best that they can give. To remedy this it will be enough that each worker should feel that the interests of the business is in his own interest.

> "As to the charge of socialism I do not know, whether I am open to

1. Gore, Charles. Orders and Unity. p 198ff.
2. Gore, Charles. Christ and Society. p 152.

"it. It has a specific definition which would certainly leave me outside of it. Only I agree with a much-honoured worker, preacher and writer of the last generation, Canon Barnett, that we have a great way to go 'towards socialism' even though, in any strict definition of the term, we should stop short some way, before we get there." 1

In the above, we may observe that Gore too, as Maurice, in very veiled language, levels a charge of selfishness against the employers, who for their own gain, would and do refuse an interest in the business to their own workers.

"Once more, we have to gird ourselves to the task of letting the world understand what the Church of Christ really stands for, what its real mind is about the foundations of society, about the relation of man to man, and class to class, and nation to nation. But I must not speak as if what I am urging were anything new today. The cause, which I plead is a cause, which has been vocal in the religious world since the days at least, of F.D. Maurice and of Shaftesbury. If we strive to do our difficult duty today, let us not forget that we are entering into the labours of other men of whom the succession has not failed." 2

"What we want, then, at home, is an organisation of the christian forces of our country. Anglicans, Free Churchmen, Friends and (if they will, consent to join with us on this field) Roman Catholics, to reassert the social meaning of christianity, as I have been endeavouring to expound it. It is this army of individuals, which we must strivé to get effectively together, to think and act as one body, to present to the world an organised body of christian opinion, which, while retaining its old

1. Ibid. p 167.
2. Ibid. p 192.

> "denominational loyalties, can unite to present afresh such an idea of the function of the Church in society as had been forgotten for some centuries." 1

From his conception of unity, Gore gave as his fundemental basis for this unity, intellectual reform, exactly what Maurice had pleaded for, when he says:

> "That then is what I am asking for, a strengthening of our intellectual basis; a reorganisation of our christian social forces, on an interdenominational basis without attachment to any political party; not claiming to be officially representative of any denomination but only of a state of mind and determination, but only of a state of mind and determination of action, which exists equally in all denominations with a strong council; but finding more than half its strength in loyal organisations of christian opinion in all our towns and in country districts also." 2

Basic to all Gore's thinking and his approach to the extension of the Church's responsibilities, he states in these words:

> "That in the deepest and fullest sense Jesus Christ is the Saviour and Redeemer of mankind, in its social as well as its individual life, and in the present world, as well as in that which is to come; and that there lies upon those, who believe in Him, a responsibility, which cannot be exaggerated to be true to the principles, which He taught, and by all available means to bring them to bear upon any society of which they form a part, especially when it professes the christian name." 3

1. Ibid. p 202.
2. Ibid. p 208.
3. Ibid. p 185.

While Coleridge clearly distinguishes ideologically the national and christian church and the respective functions of each, he does not clear up the actual relation between the two, as found in England. Gore, however, seems to be very clear in his mind concerning the Church and the State:

> "There is one more false principle of diffusion, which I must notice, it is that identification of the Church with the nation, which was the outcome of the reformation as it took place in England, and which in its best form is represented in the ecclesiastical theory of Hooker. A theory that we now perceive is profoundly dangerous. For however noble is the idea of a "Christian Nation", the Church has no right to commit itself to the State, on the assumption that the State has committed itself to the Church. What the State sanctions, is assumed to be the sufficient rule for the christian; and what the State sanctions must, in the long run, as is increasingly manifest, represent the judgment of the majority, or the wishes of 'the average man'. Thus it has come about that it is difficult to one at all familiar with the New Testament language, incredibly difficult, to persuade English people that there is a law, a social law, binding upon all christians, which is not the least abrogated, because the law of the State, representing the will of the majority, may have come to ignore it; that in order to live as christians, they have to look beyond what is generally expedient, or what appears to be practicable in State policy, up to the law, which came forth from the lips of Jesus Christ." 1

1. Gore, Charles. The Incarnation of the Son of God. p 227.

(c) William George Peck.

In W.G.Peck we have a man, who while still living, is far enough removed from the Maurician century, that he has the advantage of historical perspective that other writers have not had.

> "The Tractarians, driven from Oxford, long ostracised from the fashionable and wealthy places, opposed by the Court, the movement went into the slums and wrote a shining page in the record of the service of humanity." 1

Anglo-Catholic thought after working in with political parties and finding little satisfaction there, returned to its native direction. Peck is compelled to differ from the views of others as to the value of Maurician influence upon the social interpretation of catholic doctrine. To be sure, Maurice and Kingsley assisted to deepen in catholics, as in churchmen of all schools, a sense of social responsibility. It is probable that, with all the wisdom and nobility of Maurice's thought, some elements of its influence; at least as interpreted, helped prolong a fruitless experiment of seeking,in programmes of secular provenance.

Peck deprecated this, and now the Anglo-catholic movement in England has definitely embarked upon the attempt to outline a sociology upon catholic foundations, thus withdrawing from the tendency to be guided by political and economic factors and the conclusions of secular thinkers. However, Peck does not acknowledge that the philosophy and the theology of Maurice, in reality, provided the genuine social consciousness of the

1. Peck, W.G. The Social Implications of the Oxford Movement. p 52.

catholic movement in the English church, but that Maurice's influence deflected christian social thought into channels which might have carried it too far from its distinctive origins, in a revealed religion of redemption. Peck takes issue with Binyon's claim, that it was the grafting of Maurice's theology upon Tractarian institutionalism that brought a living and intelligent social consciousness to the catholic revival.

> "While Maurice was a great and good man", says Peck, "and a profound thinker, yet he undervalued Augustinian theology in his own 'broadening' theology. The catholic energy has sought to produce a civilisation based upon the historic religion of redemption." 1

The difference between the ideals of the Oxford Movement and the aims of secular humanism is not to be explained as due to a false emphasis upon Latin theology, which has since had to be compensated and completed by secular, but, so it is assumed, God-inspired contributions. It is the difference between the acceptance of a temporal human good, and the vision of the supernatural end, as the ground of social action. And that vision of the supernatural end has first to be restored to a broken and blinded humanity by the redemptive revelation and perpetual witness of Church and Sacrament.

Toynbee, it will be recalled, himself an apostle of fellowship, came at length to feel the need of an eternal end, which could not be found in the good of the human race. (Recalling Maurice's dicta that man and society were already in Christ and only needed to realise it.) It is just this consideration,

1. Ibid. p 96.

which constitutes the point of departure between a catholic and a secular sociology.

> "The catholic faith, can make no terms with individualism, it nevertheless requires that a true social order shall rightly evaluate the individual and necessitate his genuine creative self-expression." 1

The Tractarians declared that the church should be the organising centre of social life. In God's sight, all men, rich and poor alike,are of equal worth; the church should testify to this. The Tractarians demonstrated their interest in the poor. They encouraged works of charity; they founded orphanages and alms houses and made slum visitations and they rendered a much needed service by waging a campaign against pew rents. What they foresaw and feared was what Coleridge foresaw and feared, the loss of a sense of corporateness in society and in its place a disordered regime, which recognised no mutual ties or obligations. They sought to create not a classless society, but a cooperative society of mutual relationships and responsibilities. In this society the church was to be central, a symbol of order and a guide to holiness. 2

> "Socialism, the last of the great doctrinal systems, has already exhibited exhaustion in the attempt at definition; and whereas it started by assuming the authority of the secular state, or by invoking the authority of an international super-state, yet to appear, it is now embarrassed by a socialist criticism of the state, which emphasising the importance of the group, can sometimes propose to dispense with the state

---

1. Ibid. p 115.
2. Op.cit. Gloyn. p 75ff.

> "altogether. We have chosen our party without first choosing the only thing that can sanctify a party, namely, a religious doctrine." 1

The divorce of modern politics from fundemental faith and reason, from fundemental doctrines of God and man, probably became finally accepted as a normal habit toward the end of the 18th century, though it had been instigated much earlier. In the 19th century a notable succession of literary prophets, Carlyle, Ruskin, Dickens, Matthew Arnold and others, denounced its effects in England, without quite understanding all that was implied in their protest, But no fear struck the heart of the modern world until socialism became a force to be reckoned with.

> "The christian faith sets forth the social end as identical with the true destiny of the soul; and by this end both the soul and society are to be shaped and moulded. Religion therefore is vastly more than a private consolation, it is a public dynamic." 2

The attitude of capitalistic industrialism, as these eminent writers describe it, is a huge impertinence, because it assumes that man, who created neither himself, nor the world, has the right to say what shall be done with the world; and that its sole employment shall be for the satisfaction of his own greed. [3] Thus Peck regards the selfishness of industrialism.

The line between the doctrine that this world is "potentially God's order", and the attitude of those whom William James somewhere describes as "sky-blue moralists" has to be carefully guarded in christian theology, and Maurice, who held

---

1. Peck W.G. The Divine Society. p 14.
2. Ibid p 56.
3. Ibid p 186.

that the present human society is "already in God's order and only needs to realise it" is not always sufficiently clear in this distinction. [1]

Many would judge that the refusal of Maurice to support, as Pusey did, the attempt to bind the clergy to some affirmation upon the question of the "hopeless torments of future punishment" was proof that Maurice's outlook was much broader than Pusey's, and much more consistent with a humane and socialised attempt of a reasonable presentation of the Faith. [2]

It is of interest to note that the anglo-catholic movement in England in the institution of its annual summer school of sociology, has definitely embarked upon the attempt to outline a sociology upon catholic foundations and thus has withdrawn from the tendency to rely for its political and economic guidance upon the conclusions of secular thinkers [3] with its obvious danger of a strong drift toward humanism.

It may be fairly said that Tractarian theology was itself incapable of making contact with the real social needs of the modern world or of providing a sociological basis, until it was enlarged, transmuted and re-interpreted by other influences. There came a moment, when the catholics of the English church were persuaded to look to the economics of secularism for their social ideals. If, as has been suggested, this was due to the Maurician influence, it was unfortunate, and the mistake has been rectified. For the collectivism and communism of secularism, no matter how near their immediate proposals may seem to approach

1. Binyon G.C. History of the Christian Socialist Movement in England. pp 114.115.
2. Op.cit. Peck. Social Implications. p 54.
3. Ibid. p 84.

the christian judgment, as to what ought to be done, are based upon the "false Rousseauesque appropriation of the natural law unbalanced by the doctrine of sin", and upon a conception of the nature and purpose of society, which cannot possibly yield a sociology adequate to the christian vision. [1]

(d) V.A. Demant.

Demant sees very clearly the task of the Church in her enlarged catholicity, that it has definitely to do with social problems, based upon a spiritual inheritance.

> The christian religion in its fulness has not only a doctrine of what man ought to be; it has also a doctrine of human nature and its relation to God and the world. The teaching office of the Church should therefore claim some insight into the true and abiding needs of human beings, as distinguished from the fluctuating demands, which vary with different social situations. Her doctrine of human nature should further enable the Church to give enlightenment to all problems, fears and entanglements in which men find themselves." [2]

It is difficult to know whether Demant is in anyway influenced by Maurice. It can be assumed that the influence was indirect, as the anglo-catholic movement of more recent days, took much of its renewed life from Maurician influence.

> "Social achievements, social evils and the complexities in which these two seem to be so often mixed up, are therefore part of the material which a philosophy of life that claims the completeness of christianity should illuminate the rightness or wrongness of a social

1. Ibid. p 96.
2. Demant, V.A. God, Man and Society. p 9.

> "situation as an objective thing, to be judged by its actual effect in encouraging or hindering the response of human beings to spiritual demands. The Church has therefore through her spiritual inheritance to attack everything in the world order, 'which checks the expression of the soul's spiritual energy. We cannot sit down and be devotional, while acquiescing in conditions, which make it impossible for other souls even to obey the moral law.' Christian sociology is a necessary aspect of christian theology and condition of continued vitality in the Church's pastoral and prophetic office." 1

Where Maurice called for a reformation of the theology of the church of England, by the time Demant arrived, this had been corrected to a degree and Demant calls for a "continued vitality" rather than a reformation. A vitalised christian will not think in abstract terms nor as Demant puts it:

> "So our most distinguished neoplatonist, William Ralph Inge, lives half his life as a devotee of the eternal realities, and the other as a political writer and moralist in almost complete detachment from his theology." 2

> "A christian", says Demant, "has no business to think abstractly in terms of 'progress' or 'reaction', while the gospel is eternal and God's purpose changeless, the acceptance of it in a world, where history is a fact means a continual transition for the very purpose of reflecting eternal truth. The success or failure of humanity to do this is the measure of peaceful and harmonious or of violent and catastrophic history." 3

---

1. Ibid. p 225.
2. Demant, V.A. The Religious Prospect. p 14.
3. Op.cit. Demant. God. p 226.

(e) Herbert Hamilton Kelly. S.S.M.

Kelly makes this significant statement, significant only it should be said, in the light of the title of this paper, when he says:

> "All that I have ever learned of theological method, of the analysing of ideas, their meaning and significance, of their reference to experience and the facts of life, of the possibility and the way of coordinating ideas and experience, all that I may possess that is worth possessing, I owe to Frederick Denison Maurice. I never knew him in life; except once, I have hardly looked at a book of his for twenty five years, but I owe him everything. I am told people do not read him now. From what I can see of our present theological position, I should think that is very probable. I am told he is difficult to follow and I am afraid that is true. But I believe none the less that his is the help and guidance we need more than any other." 1

The basis of his thinking is expressed by Kelly:

> "We of the English Church are to look for our own indispensable contribution, that is, the indispensable contribution of our own church. It must have specifically to do with what, in a famous phrase was called, 'the extension of the Incarnation' 2 and of the method of the Incarnation, that is, the tabernacling in, and adoption of human lives and personality and particular chosen media, in order to give to man that special manifestation, that distinctive though inclusive gift of Himself to man, which God gave and gives through Jesus Christ." 3

---

1. Kelly, H.H. The Church and Religious Unity. p 13.
2. Charles Gore.
3. Ibid. p xii.

The catholicity of Kelly is similar to that of Maurice:

> "To us, on the catholic side, the unity of the church appeals as a great prior fact. The individual finds a place in it; it ministers to him, or rather he lives in it. As a unity, it presents itself as a great authoritative organism covering the whole world, including all mankind in idea and in God's purpose if not in fact." 1

F. Summation.

It will be necessary first of all to sum up what Maurice has meant to the Church, and some of the highlights of his position. It would seem to be a fair statement to say that Maurice stands today as the greatest thinker of the English Church in the 19th century. Almost alone among its members he possessed the wide metaphysical and philosophical knowledge and training, which enabled him to carry up the argument from the region of dogmatic theology to the philosphical debate. He was entirely antipathetic to the Liberal position. To him the Creeds were of vital significance; the Eucharist the guarantee of a Real Presence; the Ministry endowed with a real power of binding and loosing; the Prayer Book and the Thirty Nine Articles far nearer the truth of things, than the thin and troubled speculations of the 19th century.

> "The Liberals", says Masterman, "are rationalists. Maurice is a mystic seeking and finding immediately beneath and beyond the surface-show of things those spiritual realities upon which the foundations of the

1. Ibid. p 132.

> "Church are laid; the kingdom as he sees it, with its signs and its laws and its unity, Here is a fellowship not made with hands, unchallenged by the centuries, set up against the individual lusts of the world. It is no product of a kindly dream.....Its triumph will herald the consummation of all things." 1

> "The Bishops", was Lord Shaftesbury's bitter cry in 1844, "timid, time-serving, and great worshippers of wealth and power. I can scarcely remember an instance in which a clergyman has been found to maintain the cause of the labourers in the face of the pew-holders." 2

Just such a man was Maurice, who faced the pew-holders with immutable challenge, inexorable logic and impassioned invective. He refused to entertain the conception of a society passing through evolution into new states of being in which the very affirmations of the older time became meaningless and outworn.

> "Society is not to be made anew by arrangements of ours", was his protest "but is to be regenerated by finding the law and crown of its order and harmony, the only secret of its existence, in God." 3

Maurice passed through troubled waters of controversy in his own particular work as a theologian and philosopher. Prophet always rather than practical reformer, his concern was first with the things of the spirit; especially with the testing of the ancient creed and faith, which was being provided by all the ferment of the new knowledge. Henceforth his work was to be, in the main, that of protest; proclaiming always in a society

---

1. Masterman, C.F.G. Leaders of the Church 1800-1900. p 37.
2. Ibid. p 69.
3. Ibid. p 105.

becoming more and more comfortable and indifferent and to a church blind to the changes of the time, the great elemental truths upon which the universe endures; that God is the foundation of all social order, that a real kingdom exists with a king, who proclaimed its coming and that this order is steadily advancing toward a triumph.

Maurice was never a Protestant. He passed almost directly from the Unitarian position to the assertion of a kind of Liberal catholicism. And catholic he remained to the end; basing his deepest conviction upon the unity of all life; consummating in that unity in Trinity, which is the ultimate human conception of the Eternal Charity, beyond the basis of all being. He is in the tradition of those, who at least were very sure of God. He was a seer, a mystic, a prophet; charged with thoughts sometimes too great for human utterance, and occupied with a vision beyond the boundaries of time.

As late as 1860, Maurice says that he does not know what Broad Church means, but that if it means anything it must apply to followers of the Whately School, of which he was certainly not one. He was beyond all doubt right in this. Maurice's great deficiency as a theologian, is just his deficiency in certain critical qualities that belonged to Whately and others and gave an historic breadth to many of their conclusions.[1] He remained Coleridgian in the basis of his thought. It was the Coleridgian movement, under whatever modifications, that he and Kingsley really carried forward. The life of Coleridge's thought

---

1. Tulloch, John D.D. LLD. Movements of Religious Thought in Britain during the 19th cent. p 260.
2. Ibid. p 262.

survived the ecclesiastical turmoil of the 4th decade of the century and the scepticism that followed, till it emerged strong again in their hands. [1]

Maurice's Church Universal was founded on eternal, immutable truth. His great desire was to bring out the highest form of catholicity. He believed that truth should be examined, confirmed and expressed in all its different approaches, that theology was the scientia scientiarum. He was not a conservative if that means preferring the past to the present and he was strongly catholic in his views on the Trinity. To him, mankind was not in Adam, but in Christ and the difference between his and the views of the Unitarian, lay in the fact that he required redemption through Christ, while the modern unitarian position holds that redemption is an evolutionary growth.

Tennyson's words will live:

> For being of that honest few,
> Who give the Fiend himself his due,
> Should eighty thousand College Councils
> Thunder 'Anathama', friend at you.
>
> Should all our Churchmen foam in spite
> At you, so careful of the right,
> Yet one lay hearth would give you welcome
> (Take it and come) to the Isle of Wight.
>
> Come Maurice, come; the lawn as yet
> Is hoar with rime or spongy-wet;
> But when the wreath of March has blossom'd,
> Crocus, anemone, violet.
>
> Or later, pay one visit here
> For those are few we love as dear;
> Nor pay but one, but come for many,
> Many and many a happy year." [2]

How true and lasting the words:

1. Ibid. p 262.
2. Op.cit. Masterman. p 135.

> "My sword I give to him that shall succeed me in my Pilgrimage. My marks and scars I carry with me, to be a witness for me that I have fought His battles, who now will be my Rewarder ..... So he passed over, and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side." 1

Having observed the high-lights of Maurice's thinking, it is now the purpose of this paper to review the influence of Maurice upon the minds of those, who have been labelled (and we hope not unwisely) Liberal Evangelicals and Liberal Catholics. From this, endeavour to deduce from such observations, upon which party Maurice has had the greatest influence and if possible, to determine whether either the Liberal Evangelicals or the Liberal Catholics have the right to claim Maurice as the prophet and forerunner of their own particular position, and if so, which party and why.

In Charles Kingsley we find a man, who acknowledges the influence and importance, not only to himself, but to the church, of the Theological Essays. Kingsley saw eye to eye with Maurice on every count and was the prime mover in putting into practical action the theological views he had gained from Maurice. He was no broader, nor less catholic than Maurice. The difference between the two men being, that where Maurice was the thinker and an introvert, Kingsley was an able follower and an extrovert. He tended toward universalism as did Maurice, both being accused of the same "heresy".

Stanley was a decided liberal as we see in his administering the Sacrament to an Unitarian [2], yet he saw the

1. Ibid. p 198.
2. Page 39. This paper.

great need of the English Church in an enlarged catholicity. As seen from the Tractarian viewpoint, Stanley was a rationalist.[1]

Robertson showed latitudinarian tendencies in his large sympathy with humanity, but he did not live long enough to develop his theology and thus show the impact of preceding thinkers.

There is a striking similarity between Brooks and Maurice. It may be said of both these men, which can hardly be said of any others, that their catholicity is so broad and all-inclusive that it is almost impossible to "catalogue" either of the men. Maurice would appear to be actually more orthodox in the catholic tradition than Brooks, having a more traditional viewpoint. Both men caused a strong controversy and Brooks preferred to keep an intense silence while Bishops, Priests and Laity argued about his fitness as a bishop. Several close friends implored him to break his silence, but he said very simply, that his record was clear for all to read and judge and by his spoken and written record he was willing to stand or fall.

Brooks can certainly be referred to, if not classed a "Progressive Liberal", beneath was an earnestness, yea an urgency of a deep evangelical fervour, which commanded attention and endeared him to all who heard him. Somehow in the over-all "largeness" of the man's mind, one finds it well nigh impossible to ask in a "picayunish" way, whether he believed in this or that doctrinal statement. Indeed, Methodists, Baptists, Unitarians, Presbyterians and many other of the protestant denominations all testified to the fact that their own particular theological

1. Page 71. This Paper.

position was raised to a new elevation, a new plane, after having heard him; that each could have claimed him without outrage to their particular tenets.

No man ever did so much to remove prejudice against the Church, that had never been popular in New England, a resentment founded upon a distrust of the Church as oppressors of the Colony and toward its sacerdotal claims and its assumption of ecclesiastical supremacy. He protested the title of his own Communion, which was being debated in Convention and came very close to being passed. Had the title of the Church been changed to "The American Church", there is little doubt that Brooks would have left the Episcopal Communion. The writer feels that it is fair to state that Brooks carried his liberalism very much farther than did Maurice, which made it easier for liberals of another generation to "progress" farther from the catholic tradition than did Brooks.

Temple carried on the Maurician tradition and while there is no direct evidence, there was undoubtedly an inductive influence from Maurice; for Temple in his breadth and his desire for seeking truth in every avenue of thought reflected the same trend of mind as did Maurice. Temple believed strongly in the unity of society. It remains yet to be seen how Temple in this modern day will apply the enlarged catholicity of the church. But it would appear that there is to be little doubt of this in his position as Archbishop of Canterbury and the part his high office will play, and has already began to play, in the making of a just

and durable peace, in which the Church is going to have expression.

As we come to the Liberal Catholic group, we find Holland, while definitely catholic, was not a conservative of the old school. He held unswervingly to the affirmations of the Nicene Creed and the fundementals of the traditional faith. His view of miracles, like Maurice, was very broad and following his predecessor Maurice, he wanted more vigorously-minded christians.

Gore held to a greater catholicity of the church, believing to a very great degree in an enlarged conception of the duty of the Church toward the masses. As to unity, he based it, as did Maurice, upon an intelligent reformation through enlightened understanding.

Peck, removed from Maurice almost a century, goes right back to Maurice and takes issue with him in ignoring Augustinian theology. He does not believe that Maurice's theology brought out of Tractarian institutionalism a living and intelligent social consciousness. The writer takes issue with Peck on this, for evidence as given in this paper shows that it was Maurician influence, that brought about a big change in the social consciousness of both Liberal Evangelicals and Liberal Catholics. To be sure, the immediate effect of Maurician theology upon Tractarian Institutionalism was not immediate for the reason that the Tractarians at that time and for several decades following Maurice, were concerned principally with bringing the Church back to a catholicity, that Maurice was pleading for, although in a

manner unnacceptable to him. Not until half a century had passed did Maurician theology affect the Tractarians to the point where they put into effect a revitalised social approach. Peck acknowledges that Maurice assisted in deepening in Catholics a sense of social responsibility.

Demant sees clearly the necessity of an enlarged catholicity in the Church to cope with modern social problems. Maurice's influence was indirect coming through the Tractarian tradition and the rejuvenated anglo-catholic social movement. Demant calls for a continued vitality in the Church, where Maurice called for theological reformation.

Kelly admits that he owes his mode of thinking to Maurice. Like Maurice he sees the use of an enlarged catholicity of the Church in its essential unity covering the world. As to the words "enlarged Catholicity", which have been used somewhat extensively; it may be said that these very words differentiate between the Liberal or Progressive Catholic and the Anglo-catholic of the Tractarian variety. One would appear to be progressive and the other static. The progressive catholic works for an enlarged catholicity of the Church, while the other is content with anglo-catholicism as it is and always has been.

It seems proper at this point to give a statement concerning the position of both the Liberal Evangelical and the Liberal Catholic. The former would keep central the Gospel of the divine redemption offered in the life and death of our Lord. The inward, personal faith is stressed to guard against externalism,

ritualism, institutionalism and intellectualism. A liberalism of the mind is sought to guard against narrow and set dogmatisms. Freedom of mind is desired for historical study, theological interpretation and reverent experimentation in worship. The Liberal Evangelical claims to be catholic within the meaning of the great words of the Creeds and is interested in proving apostolic succession by a greater faithfulness to apostolic daring in the service of human needs, by new methods and in new forms as occasion and increasing knowledge may require.

The Liberal Catholic regards the Church as being, not the "end", but the means to an end. He is not so much submissive to authority as he is to spiritual growth under authority. He desires worship to the whole man as opposed to the intellectual approach. While the Liberal Evangelical's approach is subjective, the Liberal Catholic's is objective; the former emphasises a discipline of the emotions, while the latter emphasises the discipline of an ordered rule of life. The Liberal Evangelical appears to regard the importance of religious philosophic speculation as opposed to the position of the Liberal Catholic, who emphasises the importance of dogmatic theology with its objective emphasis, which leads us to say that one cannot sacrifice for a concept, which is the ultimate in the speculations of the religious philosophers, but for a personality, which is the ultimate in the objective emphasis of the catholic tradition.

Reviewing both sides it appears to this writer that the Liberal Catholics have more right to claim Maurice as their

"patron saint", than do the Liberal Evangelicals for the following reasons:

1. The Liberal Evangelical theology of today, speaking very broadly, does not, nor cannot admit of continuity with Maurician theology in its catholicity. The Liberal Evangelicals of today would appear to be very much more rationalistic than Maurice ever dreamed of being.

2. The Liberal Evangelicals seem to have taken the more "liberal" points of Maurician theology and expanded them as far as it is possible for them to be expanded. Indeed may we not ask the question whether the modern Liberal Evangelical would accept in toto the Nicene Creed ? Whether he would accept as did Maurice the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist ? Whether he would accept the Prayer Book and Thirty Nine Articles as being nearer the truth than the speculations of religious philosophers ?

3. The Liberal Evangelicals come closer to the Whately School of Thought of the 19th century, than ever did Maurice, without however exhibiting the keenness of analysis that Whateley exhibited in his scholarship.

4. As has been observed [1] the Liberal Evangelicals in their continuance of the Maurician impact upon the Christian Socialisation have run aground in their tendency to be guided by political and economic factors and the conclusions of secular thinkers.

5. In the above we have the separation of the ways

1. Page 96. This paper.

between the Liberal Evangelicals and the Liberal Catholics. The latter have gone back to the emphasis, which Maurice laid upon theology and are attempting to lay a sociology upon catholic foundations. They have realised that a secular humanism (for that is what the Liberal Evangelicals practice, even if they do not so profess) cannot give life to a christian sociology and so they have gone back to the "supernatural end of man" as Aquinas outlined.

6. The Liberal Catholics have realised the futility of individualism in dealing with christian sociology. Thus bearing out Maurice's contention and men following him in the catholic tradition, that the Church must exhibit an enlarged catholicity of a corporate nature for the unity of society all over the world.

7. Following Maurice's statement that the world is "potentially in God's Order", the Liberal Catholics have realised that society based upon natural law cannot possibly yield a sociology adequate to the christian vision, therefore they have concerned themselves with the catholic tradition within the Church to give life to that which almost died in the hands of those, who viewed such problems from a far more liberal angle.

8. The Liberal Catholics follow Maurice and Gore in their belief that society, its unity and salvation lies not in secular provenance, but in the Incarnation and the Redemption that Christ offered and from that, as Gore ably expressed the matter, through "the extension of the Incarnation", the Holy Catholic Church, builded upon the work of our Blessed Lord and the

teaching of His Apostles.

Gloria Deo in Excelsis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allen A.V.G.
   Phillips Brooks. 1907

2. Allen A.V.G.
   Continuity of Christian Thought. 1884.

3. Allen A.V.G.
   Life and Letters of Phillips Brooks.
   3 vols. 1901. vol 2.

4. Allen A.V.G.
   Ditto. vol 3.

5. Aubrey.
   Present Theological Tendencies. 1936.

6. Binyon G.C.
   History of the Christian Socialist
   Movement in England. 1934.

7. Brooke, Stopford A.
   Life and Letters of F.W.Robertson. 1865.

8. Brookfield, F.M.
   The Cambridge Apostles. 1906.

9. Cambridge Modern History. Vol 12.

10. Coleridge, H.N. (Editor)
    Essays on his own times.
    3 vols. vol 2. 1850.

11. Coleridge, H.N. (Editor)
    Statesman's Manual. 1839.

12. Demant, V.A.
    The Religious Prospect. 1939.

13. Demant, V.A.
    God, Man and Society. 1934.

14. Encyclopedia Americana. 1940.

15. Encyclopedia Brittanica. 1940.

19. Gloyn Cyril K.
The Church in the Social Order. 1942.

20. Gore Charles.
Orders and Unity. 1909.

21. Gore Charles.
Incarnation of the Son of God. 1891.

22. Gore Charles.
Christ and Society. 1928.

23. Gore Charles.
The Sermon on the Mount. 1899.

24. Keble John.
Occasional Papers and Reviews. 1887.

25. Kelly Herbert Hamilton. S.S.M.
The Church and Religious Unity. 1913.

26. Kelly Herbert Hamilton. S.S.M.
The Gospel of God. 1928.

27. Kingsley Mrs Charles. (Editor)
Charles Kingsley; His letters
and Memories of His Life. 1877.

28. Lathbury D.C.
Correspondence on Church and Religion
of William E. Gladstone.
2 Vols. Vol. 1. 1910.

29. Lyttelton Rev. the Hon. Edward.
The Mind and Character of Henry
Scott Holland. 1926.

30. Masterman C.F.G.
Leaders of the Church 1800-1900.
F.D.Maurice. 1907.

31. Maurice F.
Life of F.D.Maurice
2 Vols. Vol. 1. 1884.

32. Maurice F.
Ditto. Vol. 2.

33. Maurice F.D.
Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy.
2 Vols. Vol.1. 1889.

34. Maurice F.D.
Kingdom of Christ.
2 Vols. Vol 1. 1891.

35. Maurice F.D.
Ditto. Vol 2.

36. Maurice F.D.
Theological Essays. 1871.

37. Maurice F.D.
Social Morality. 1893.

38. Miller Spencer Jr and Fletcher Joseph E.
The Church and Industry. 1930.

39. Newman J.H.
Letters and Correspondence.
2 Vols. Vol 1. 1891.

40. Newman J.H.
The Via Media of the Anglican
Church. 2 Vols. Vol 2. 1890.

41. Newman J.H.
Fifteen Sermons preached before
the University of Oxford. 1872.

42. Newman J.H.
Essay on the Development of
Christian Doctrine. 1906.

43. Peck George William.
The Divine Society. 1925.

44. Peck George William.
The Social Implications of the
Oxford Movement. 1933.

45. Pfleiderer O.
The Development of Theology in
Germay since Kant and its progress
in Great Britain since 1825.

46. Prothero R.E.
Life and Correspondence of
Arthur P. Stanley.
2 Vols. Vol 1. 1894.

47. Prothero R.E.
Ditto. Vol. 2.

48. Sanders Charles Richard.
Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement. 1942.

49. Shedd W.G.T. (Editor)
Specimens of the Table Talk of the late Samuel Taylor Coleridge. 1884.

50. Sidgwick Henry.
F.D.Maurice.
Contemporary Review. Vol 65. 1894.

51. Smyth Charles.
The Art of Preaching. 1940.

52. Temple William.
The Kingdom of God. 1912.

53. Temple William.
Basic Convictions. 1936.

54. Temple William.
The Hope of a New World. 1941.

55. Temple William.
Nature, Man and God. 1935.

56. Tract 43.

57. Tract 61.

58. Tract 87.

59. Tulloch John. D.D. LLd.
Movements of Religious Thought in Britain during the 19th century. 1901.

60. Wieman and Meyland.
American Philosophy of Religion.

GTU Library
3 2400 00687 2075

LIBRARY USE ONLY